


**SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND
BARTHOLOMEW SUFFERERS**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Sequestered Loyalists and Bartholomew Sufferers AND OTHER HISTORICAL PAPERS



BY
CHRISTOBEL M. HOOD
(MRS. IVO HOOD) F.R.HIST.S.

(AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF AN EAST ANGLIAN SOKE," "RECORDS OF
A NORFOLK VILLAGE." ETC.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

WITH A PREFACE BY
THE REVEREND THE HONOURABLE
EDWARD LYTTTELTON, D.D.

JARROLD'S
PUBLISHERS (LONDON) LTD.
1922

DA27
#6

THE
ASSOCIATION

REVIEWS

DEDICATED TO THE MEMBERS
OF THE NORFOLK BRANCH OF THE
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

v
M88114

PREFACE

NOT long ago a person of inquiring mind wrote from England to a relative away in one of our Colonies a behest that the said relative should seek among friends for an answer to the question : " Why do we read History ? " In six weeks the unsatisfying rejoinder came. " We don't." At the time there was nothing more to be said. It may be surmised that serious reading of history in this country is confined to a small and, perhaps, dwindling minority. But there are certainly enough of these to make it worth while that records such as are collected in this book should be compiled : then written out : then published : then read : then finally digested. Now, of these five processes, Mrs. Hood has contributed more than half—playing her part faithfully and well. It remains for others to whom the subject appeals—be they learned people, or sciolists, or dabblers, or ignoramuses—to play theirs.

Not only in concession to the claims of friendship : nor only as a dabbler in the subject : I desire to commend these papers, but because I know something of the really valuable contribution to our

knowledge of Norfolk in the past that the authoress has already made. Also, because a perusal of two of these essays—no more being feasible—has convinced me that the same sterling qualities of accuracy, fairness of mind, and deep patriotic feeling have been again manifested here in no common measure.

There is another quality of the book which at first blush a hasty reader might rate as a blemish, but which in good sooth is quite the contrary. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions from the curious and often unexpected facts here set down ; to form his own judgments and, in short, to build up for himself a little fabric of historical knowledge, of which these facts are the indispensable foundation.

Herein, Mrs Hood treats her reader with due respect. She has hinted that his own imagination is to him worth more than anyone else's—and how true that is !

Meantime I would advise all residents in Norfolk, who know what an interesting and distinctive county it is, to pass by, if they can, the matrimonial chapter and begin by plunging into "A NORFOLK VILLAGE IN 1800," and to make sure that they read it three times through. If after doing so, their desire to read the rest of the book is not quickened, I should advise them to recognize a regrettable disability in themselves, and do the best they can with the present and future. For as to the past,

that is as to History and all its lessons, I fear they must regard it in the light of the mournful adage :
" Let bygones be bygones."

E. LYTTTELTON.

OVERSTRAND, NORFOLK,
August, 1922.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - - -	7
I. SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND BAR- THOLOMEW SUFFERERS - - -	13
II. THE SAD HISTORY OF MARGERY DE LA BÉCHE - - - - - -	93
III. DID PRE-REFORMATION PRIESTS EVER MARRY ? - - - - -	112
IV. A NORFOLK VILLAGE IN 1800 - - -	131
V. NORFOLK RATES IN DAYS GONE-BY - -	140
VI. MANORIAL HISTORY - - - -	150
VII. CHANGES IN THE MANOR - - -	183

“SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND BARTHOLOMEW SUFFERERS OR CONFORMISTS AND NONCONFORMISTS IN NORFOLK IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ”¹

SAMUEL PALMER, the editor of Calamy's "Nonconformists' Memorial," asserts that "memoirs of the lives and characters of wise and good men, especially such as have suffered for conscience sake, have generally been esteemed some of the most entertaining and useful publications." If this statement is true, it may be of interest to Norfolk people to hear something of the sufferings endured by various ministers of religion in this county under the changing conditions of the seventeenth century. First we must turn to the history of the "Sequestered Loyalists" as they were called, clergy of the Anglican Church, who were turned out of their livings during the Civil War and Commonwealth, and then we shall go on to learn the fate of their successors, the so-called "Bartholomew Sufferers," who were ejected for Nonconformity in 1662.²

¹ A portion of this paper was read to the Norfolk Branch of the Historical Association at Norwich, November, 1921.

² I do not propose to touch on the history of the Non-Jurors, for they belong to a different period of history, even though they were deprived during the seventeenth century.

14 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

In dealing with any particular period of History one is faced with one big difficulty—a difficulty of limitation. Where to begin? Where to end? To divide History up merely into centuries is obviously absurd—though it is often very convenient—for the continuous stream of events and developments which we call History is not interrupted nor materially affected by the beginning or ending of a purely arbitrary and artificial period of a hundred years. Nevertheless we all *do* break up our history into centuries, and, as I have said, it is a convenient, if not a specially scientific method of classification.

Take, however, a subject like the one now before us, and you will see that while its roots are struck deep in the preceding sixteenth century, the ripening of its fruit of religious toleration was not accomplished until the early nineteenth century.

I hope, therefore, that you will forgive me if I begin this paper with a short account of some of the happenings in the religious life of England which led up to the bitter conflicts of the seventeenth century.

It is customary for historians to laud or decry the English Reformation according to their individual theological bias. A close study of authorities, both Anglican and Roman Catholic, leaves the ordinary lay mind with an increasingly strong conviction that there was very little religion in the religious disputes of the sixteenth century.

Fanaticism, political expediency and party spirit appear to be the outstanding characteristics of the theological discussions of the period. And yet against all that is depressing in sixteenth century Church History, we must set one striking and noble feature, I mean the truly magnificent courage and faith of the men of both sides in the day of persecution and adversity. This is equally true of Anglican, Roman Catholic and Protestant Dissenter. The tragedy of it all lay in the disappointing fact that confessors who had indeed seemed blessed when men reviled them and persecuted them, could often with a change of government be transformed into as narrow-minded and bitter religious tyrants as those who had before been their persecutors. It comes as something of a shock, moreover, to find that the first things that the returned exiles from Zurich and Geneva thought of, and clamoured for, at the accession of Elizabeth, were place and preferment. Even Jewel's letters to Peter Martyr disclose a spirit of self-seeking which goes ill with the professions of a minister of the Gospel. While the exiles scrambled thus for benefices and bishoprics, the adherents of the Marian régime were being brought to book for their actions and beliefs. Bishop Bonner's name stands out pre-eminently as representative of all that is most detestable in the fanatical persecutions of Mary's reign. How did the persecutor conduct himself when his day of adversity came? Again we get one of those surprises

which the sixteenth century so often gives to the twentieth century, for what could be more courageous and noble than his answer to those who forbade him to say mass in St. Paul's Cathedral? "I possess," said he, "three things—soul, body, and property. Of the two (last) you can dispose at your pleasure, but as to the soul God alone can command me." The same spirit of fearless devotion was shown again and again during Elizabeth's reign by the missionary priests whose zeal for their cause led them actually to *welcome* sufferings and death itself.

I suppose we must not attempt to judge the men of the sixteenth century according to our modern standards. Violent and radical changes followed each other in such rapid succession that no one knew exactly where he stood, or for how long he would stand there! It has been said wisely that the Reformation settlement (as it is rather ironically called) did not arrive at any sort of completion "until the Savoy Conference—a century and a third after the beginning of the movement. At no point previous to that date can it be said that things had reached a settlement."¹ Before that settlement was reached each party in turn had to bear its share of persecution.

Look first at the effects of the restoration of Papal supremacy in 1555. Large numbers of clergy and

¹ Bp. W. E. Collins, "The English Reformation" (Church Historical Society, pubd. S.P.C.K.), pp. 22, 31, etc.

laity fled to the Continent, whilst others remained in England to endure all the rigours of the Marian persecution. It is estimated that at this time about 800 clergy were driven from their livings—they were but the first of a long series of ejected ministers. Elizabeth's accession turned the tables, and in 1559 and the following five years or so between 189 and 250 priests are certainly known to have been deprived through failure to take the Oath of Supremacy or to conform to the Act of Uniformity. These numbers seem relatively very small, and there is little doubt that they are not complete, although the first figure (189) is arrived at from the evidence of Bishop's Registers and other diocesan documents, whilst the second (250) is that given by the contemporary, Cardinal Allen. The total number of clergy in England at that date is reckoned at between 9,200 and 9,400.¹ The Rev. H. N. Birt, however, has gone far to prove that the figures relating to the ejected clergy in the first few years of Elizabeth's reign are absurdly incomplete, and he claims that a number of priests nearer 700 than 250 left their livings, out of a total of about 7,500 benefices.² It should be noted, however, that a contemporary survey of benefices made for Lord Burghley states the number of livings to be 8,731.

¹ See Camden, Collins and "The First Douay Diary" (which gives 9,285 as the figure).

² The Rev. H. N. Birt, "The Elizabethan Religious Settlement," pp. 161-3.

Doubtless there were very many priests who conformed for the time being, hoping that before long the Papal supremacy would again be re-established, as for example, Dr. Philip Baker, Provost of King's, Cambridge, who shrewdly remarked "that which hath been may be again," whilst he and others in Cambridge caused much "Church gear" to be hidden "against another day."¹ Certain it is that some priests conformed and took the Oath of Supremacy although their allegiance remained elsewhere, whilst others again quietly disappeared amongst the ranks of the laity² and continued to minister in secret to their dispersed and scanty flock. The "Douay Diaries," indeed, tell us that as late as 1596, between forty and fifty Marian priests were still working in England.

¹ As late as 1580 Mr. Thomas Houghton, of Houghton, who died at Liège, left £100 to buy "a payr of organs, one fayr table and as many bookes of musick as should cost 7 *li*, which he appoynted to be given to the church of Preston *when time should serve*." His executor was Cardinal Allen, who, himself in 1594, "left by will certain chasubles of small value which he had in his Chapel to the parish church where he was born, *when the people should become Catholics*, and that, meanwhile they were to be kept in the chapel of the English College" in Rome. See "Letters of Cardinal Allen," p. 85 and p. cxix.

² Bp. Cox writes to Peter Martyr, Dec. 21st, 1559: "The popish priests amongst us are daily relinquishing their ministry, lest, as they say, they should be compelled to give their sanction to heresies." See *ibid.*, p. 176.

³ Father Holt, S.J., gave these figures in a contemporary paper, entitled "How the catholic religion was maintained in England during 38 years of persecution, and how it may still be preserved there." See "Douay Diaries," p. 378.

Whatever the actual number of priests ejected at and immediately after Elizabeth's accession, it is clear that they were but a small proportion of all the clergy of the country. Turning to the Norwich diocese in particular, we find that the new régime was evidently welcomed with readiness, for no less than 525 clergy subscribed to the oath when the Visitation of the Diocese took place in 1559.¹ Authorities vary greatly as to the probable total of the clergy then resident in the diocese. Dr. Jessopp computed the number at 600, but this seems to be too low an estimate, even when allowance is made for the many vacant benefices enumerated by Bishop Parkhurst, of Norwich, in his inquiry of 1562-3. From the evidence available it is, however, obvious that in Norfolk, as elsewhere, it was only a small minority which refused to accept the Elizabethan settlement.²

In the *authenticated* lists of clergy deprived in 1558-64 we find only sixteen Norfolk priests—Harpsfield, Dean of Norwich, being one. The full list is as follows :³

¹ The Visitors held sessions at Ipswich, Blythburgh, Beccles, Norwich Cathedral, St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich, North Walsham, Walsingham, Lynn, Swaffham, Thetford and Bury.

² See Gee, "The Elizabethan Clergy," pp. 96, 97. See also, Birt, "The Elizabethan Religious Settlement," pp. 179 and 378-84, for arguments in proof that a larger number were ejected.

³ See Gee, "The Elizabethan Clergy," pp. 252-70.

20 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Name with date of Successor.</i>		<i>Cure and date of Institution.</i>
1. ANDERSON, Simon	1561	HINGHAM, 1556
2. BRADLEY, T.	'64	TUDDENHAM, '54
3. BUTTELL, R.	'63	COKELEY (? COCKLEY CLEY), '63
4. CALNER, R.	'60	SCOLE.
5. CARTER, H.	'62	DENTON.
6. COLE, Andrew	'64	SCULTHORPE.
7. COLLINSON, J.	'60	ECCLES, '41
8. HARCOURT, —	—	NORWICH, Prebendary.
9. HARPSFIELD, J. ¹	'60	NORWICH, Dean of.
10. HAVER, Oliver	'60	BURGH, '58
11. HUDSON, Hugh	'62	TITCHWELL, '47
12. LACHE, R. ²	'64	GIMINGHAM, '31
13. PAYNE, Robert	'63	SAHAM TONEY, '58
14. SEWELL, J.	'63	STRUMPSHAW, '55
15. TAYLOR, R.	'59	WESTWICK, '55

Another ten were deprived between 1564–70, viz. :³

<i>Name with date of Successor.</i>		<i>Cure and date of Institution.</i>
1. RANDALL, Robert	1565	BEDINGHAM.
2. GOUGH, J.	'66	CARLTON COLVILLE, 1560
3. BOWLING, R.	'67	WALPOLE.
4. GOODFELLOW, W.	'67	BRANDESTON.

¹ Harpsfield was also Prebendary of Exeter and of Mapesbury, London, and Archdeacon of London.

² Lache had previously subscribed to the Oath of Supremacy in 1559—possibly he had changed his views—or he may have been deprived for some other reason.

The Rector of LANGFORD (name not given) was also deprived at this time.

³ See Gee, pp. 290, 291.

<i>Name with date of Successor.</i>		<i>Cure and date of Institution.</i>
5. WALKER, R.	1568	BINTREE.
6. HATTON, W.	'68	STODY.
7. FROST, W.	'69	STIFFKEY.
8. MOORE, T.	'69	E. HARLING.
9. TYE, T.	'69	ROGDON (? ROYDON).
10. BARNEY, Robert	'69	REEDHAM.

It seems quite extraordinary that at the very utmost only twenty-five clergy refused the Elizabethan Settlement in the large county of Norfolk.¹ This is less surprising, however, when we learn from Dr. Gee that the total number of clergy who were deprived *for all causes in England and Wales in 1558-60*, numbered but four hundred, and, he adds, "It is hard to believe that more than 200 were deprived for Papal sympathies in the first six years of Elizabeth."

Elizabeth's policy was to enforce religious uniformity upon all her subjects whether Catholic or Protestant, and the Puritans and Sectaries were treated very much in the same way as the Papists. In the Lists of Recusants drawn up at various times during her reign, the names of Roman Catholics and Protestant Nonconformists are often intermixed, as for example in the List of Norfolk Recusants for the year 1595, printed in the "East Anglian," volume II, page 177, etc. The Elizabe-

¹ E. Suffolk was, of course, still included in the diocese of Norwich at that time, but for the present purpose I am only dealing with *Norfolk* clergy.

thans had yet to learn that it is a difficult matter to attempt to make men agree by Act of Parliament, and that it is doubly impossible to over-ride men's consciences by means of legislation.¹ Refusal to subscribe to the Oath of Supremacy was followed by deprivation, whilst heavy fines or imprisonment were imposed on those recusants who neglected to attend their parish churches,—such were the usual methods of sixteenth century government, and “no one side was more given to them than another.” The very idea of religious toleration was still unknown in Tudor England.

For the present, I wish to leave the story of the Papist recusants and only consider that of the two groups of Protestant Dissenters—the Puritans and the Sectaries.

At first the Reformers had been working from within the Church in an attempt to free it from Roman abuses and to bring it back to a more primitive form of Christianity. As time went on, however, two distinct parties emerged, the first claimed that the Church was “part of God's enduring order in the world,” and therefore “desired

¹ Advocates of religious toleration were few and far between, but during the discussion of an abortive Bill for Compulsory Communion in 1571, “a protest was twice made by Mr. Aglionby in favour of liberty of conscience. He was willing to compel attendance at Church, but regarded compulsory Communion as a wrongful forcing of conscience. ‘The conscience of man,’ he said, ‘is eternal, invisible, and not in the power of the greatest monarchy in the world in any limits to be straitened.’” W. H. Frere, “A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I,” p. 160.

to purify and to amend it in certain directions, because its constitution and character seemed to them to be, in one way or another, perverted and wrong.’¹ The party holding these views was called Puritan, and “in process of time,” writes Calamy, “the vicious multitude called all *Puritans* who were strict and serious, and of holy lives, though ever so conformable. So that the same name in a bishop’s mouth signified a *Nonconformist*; and in an ignorant drunkard’s or swearer’s mouth, a godly obedient christian.”

The second party consisted of “those who conceived that the Church, as they saw it, was nothing but a worldly society, or indeed a synagogue of Satan. Their idea accordingly was to ‘come out of her,’ to start entirely afresh upon clear ground and to erect such a building upon the foundation as seemed to them to answer the true scriptural conception of religion. . . . These were,” in fact, “men who appear to have thought that the best way to get at the spirit of religion was to destroy its body and that the true idea of worship could not be liberated until its form was annihilated.”² This was the Sectarian party.

Both Puritan and Sectary came in for a good deal of political as well as religious persecution under Elizabeth and her successors, and became alienated still further from the Church. It has been wisely

¹ Collins, “The English Reformation,” p. 102.

² *Ibid.*

said that "those who are treated as sysmatics easily become sysmatics."¹ In the case of the conflict between the Church and the Protestant Dissenters those in authority were only too apt and ready to assume that the word *Sect* owed its derivation to *Seco*, I cut; rather than to *Sequor*, I follow. If individuals claimed to be followers of Apollos or Paul or Cephas, they might be in danger of emphasising some particular part of the Gospel in place of preaching the whole Gospel message, but for that reason it did not follow that they were to cut themselves off, or to be cut off, from the Body.²

As a matter of fact the Puritans, at first, earnestly desired to remain within the Church, and even Calvin himself sanctioned the use of the Book of Common Prayer, whilst Beza strongly advised the Puritans "to consent to use the habits" (Strype).³

In 1566 a number of Puritan clergy found themselves deprived of their benefices following the circulation of Archbishop Parker's *Advertisements*. His successor in the Archbishopric in 1575 was the strong, yet sympathetic, Whitgift, whose portrait is drawn for us by a contemporary—"being made Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, and of the privy council, he carried himself in that mild and charitable course, that he was not only approved greatly, by all the Clergy of *England*, but even some of those, whom with his pen he might seem to have wounded; I mean these called *Puritans*, of whom he won

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

² *Ibid.*, p. 163.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

divers by sweet perswasions to conformity." Yet the year 1580 saw the publication of a book which opened a new chapter in the history of the Puritans, "The Book of Discipline," by Travers and Cartwright. This work which has been called "the standard of the Puritans" propounded a complete scheme for a Church reformed on the Presbyterian model, with its members organized into Presbyteries, Classes and Synods. Sixty-four years later, in 1644, the book was reprinted by authority of the Westminster Assembly, under the title of "A Directory of Church Government," and formed the basis of Puritan Church government under the Parliament. Long before 1644, however, an early attempt had been made to work this Presbyterian system *within* the Church, and "presbyteries and classes were formed in many districts, beginning, it is said, at Cockfield, near Lavenham, in Suffolk, and gradually spreading into the Midland counties and on to the North." Naturally Church discipline had to be enforced and the last years of Elizabeth's reign saw the removal of a large number of Protestant Nonconformist clergy from their livings. These ministers and their sympathizers rejoiced at the accession of James I and greeted him on his arrival in London with a Petition showing their position and embodying sundry requests, expressed with studied moderation. As a result the Hampton Court Conference was called in January, 1604 (to which we owe the Authorized Version of the Bible

and the last part of the Church Catechism). The Puritans, however, got no fair hearing, and their relationship with the English Church remained in exactly the same position as before. Many still counted themselves as members of the Church, and continued to work within its borders, as chaplains, lecturers and in any capacity where preaching was possible without conforming to the use of the Prayer Book. In the years which followed, a series of strong and uncompromising bishops defined the Church position in no uncertain terms and would have done much to bring religious parties into line had not the political disturbances and Civil War of the seventeenth century rendered a religious settlement impossible. In the struggle between King and Parliament, the Bishops mainly supported the doctrine of Divine Right, and thus "all the forces of liberty and licence were thrown on the side of Puritanism."¹ From the first many of the Norfolk clergy were strongly inclined towards Puritan methods of thought and worship, and when the great conflict began between Laud and the Anglicans, and the Nonconforming bodies, there must have been a large number of them whose sympathies were hostile to the Archbishop, and who rejoiced when the Puritans came into power in 1643.

Amongst those who assembled at the summons of Parliament on July 1, 1643, in Henry VII's Chapel

¹ Collins, "The English Reformation," p. 139.

at Westminster, for the purpose of abolishing episcopacy and the Prayer Book, were three Norfolk divines—Henry Hall, B.D., of Norwich, John Arrowsmith, of Lynn, and Thomas Thorowgood, of Little Massingham.¹

The Westminster divines had "to approve all that should be admitted into any Church Livings. They had no power to put any out, but only were to judge of the fitness of such as were taken in. The power of casting out was in a committee of members of parliament at London, and partly, also, in the committees of the several counties." Calamy asserts that "but few were cast out for their religious beliefs and it is pity there were any!" The facts of history and statistics do not, alas, bear out Calamy's pious sentiments. He tells us that in the early days of the Civil War the ministers "generally preached and prayed against disloyalty. They had drawn up a writing to the lord general declaring their abhorrence of all violence against the person of the King, and urging him and his army to have no concern in it. This

¹ Presented to the Rectory by William Thorowgood, 1620, in succession to Edward Thorowgood. Another member of the Assembly was Edward Corbet, of Merton College, Oxford. Was he the same Edward Corbet, noted for his Puritanical sympathies, who was rector of North Repps, 1636 to c. 1667, and of Sidestrand, 1660 to 1662? Calamy does not support this theory, but some weight is lent to it by the fact that Edward Corbet and Thomas Thorowgood signed their names side by side in the Presbyterian memorial to the lord general protesting against the use of violence to the King's person. It is not unlikely that two Norfolk ministers should sign together.

petition they presented to him, when the King was in danger, subscribed by near sixty of the presbyterian ministers of London together with many country ministers. So unjustly were the presbyterians accused as regicides ! ”

The majority of the Presbyterians may have been opposed to the King's death, certainly *all* of them were in favour of the immediate abolition of episcopacy. One of them, Dr. Alexander Leighton, went so far as to cry (in his book, “ Sion's Plea ”), “ Kill all the Bishops ! ” Meanwhile the House of Commons passed Bills for “ The utter eradication of bishops,” whilst

“ The Oyster-women lockt their Fish up,
And trudg'd away to cry No Bishop ! ”

The Church supporters in Parliament rallied so badly to the Cause, that Lord Falkland was led to remark “ that they who hated Bishops hated them worse than the Devil ; and they who lov'd them, did not love them as well as their Dinner.”

After the abolition of episcopacy, the Puritans next put an end to the “ Rites, Ceremonies and Usages of the Church,” forbade the Lord's Prayer as “ popish,”¹ prohibited the use of the Prayer Book

¹ “ Since the sad and dismall times of distraction in church and state, the people in most of the northerne country was much deprived of the benefitt of those holy ordinances of the Word and Sacraments ; but especially of the latter, which, with the use of the Lord's Praier, was wholely laid aside, as under the notion of reliques of idolatrie and popish superstition.” “ Autobiography of Mrs. Alice Thornton,” p. 204. (Surtees Society.)

and the keeping of Christmas, and even made an unsuccessful attempt to destroy some at least of the Cathedrals—a committee being appointed in 1652 to consider “ what *Cathedrals* are fit to stand, or what to be *pull'd down* ; and how such as shall be pull'd down, may be apply'd to the Payment of the *Publick Faith*.”¹

The Covenant was thrust upon clergy and laity alike, and within the space of a few years more than half the parsons in the country had been turned out of their livings for refusal to accept it. Parson-

¹ Bishop Hall describes the desecration of Norwich Cathedral. “ It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege, whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses. . . . Lord, what work was there ! what clattering of glasses ! what beating down of walls ! what tearing up of monuments ! what pulling down of seats ! what wresting of iron and brass from the windows and graves ! what defacing of arms ! what demolishing of curious stone-work, that had not any representation in the World, but only of the cost of the founder, and skill of the mason ! what tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ-pipes ! and what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country ; when in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ-pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross which had been newly sawn down from over the Green-yard pulpit, and the service-books and singing-books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market-place ; a lewd wretch walking before the train, in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service-book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn the tune, and usurping the words of the litany formerly used in the Church. Near the public cross, all these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire. . . . Neither was it any news, upon this guild-day, to have the cathedral, now open on all sides, to be filled with musketeers, waiting for the major's return ; drinking and tobacconing as freely as if it had turned ale-house.” “ Hard Measure,” Hall's Collected Works, 1837 edition, p. lv.

hunting became general and the unfortunate clergy were hailed before the Committees, speedily to find themselves either sequestered or ejected. In Norfolk, Miles Corbet, recorder of Yarmouth and regicide, was "the most diligent adversary of the clergy." By July, 1647, several thousands of Anglican clergy had already been deprived. One Member of Parliament, Rigby by name, went so far as to enter "into a contract for the sale of some to be used as slaves on foreign plantations, and twice brought forward a motion that they should be sold. Numbers escaped and found a safe refuge on the Continent or in Virginia."¹ One priest of the Norwich diocese, Henry Starling, rector of Homersfield, Suffolk, actually died on the voyage to Virginia, leaving "his wife in a very sorrowful and indigent condition; who thereby became a distressed and sad Object of Charity."

Few nowadays question the fact that the clergy suffered the very greatest hardships at this time, and it is fortunate that the authentic story of a large number is preserved for us in Walker's "Sufferings of the Clergy," published in 1714, a little over fifty years after "Black Bartholomew." This work was compiled as an answer to the ninth chapter of Calamy's "Life of Baxter," in which the writer contends that the sufferings of the Non-conformists in 1662 were far greater than those

¹ See a letter to the "Eastern Daily Press," by the Rev. H. G. Pickard, LL.D., dated from East Ruston Vicarage, Nov. 17th, 1921.

endured by the clergy under the Commonwealth. On the evidence supplied in both books, Walker goes far to prove his case that the episcopalians were called upon to bear far worse hardships, and in much larger numbers, than were the Nonconformists at "Black Bartholomew."

The two books shall speak for themselves. We will first take the case of the "Sequestered Loyalists" in the county of Norfolk. It will be remembered that Norfolk was one of the "Seven Associated Counties" grouped together under the Earl of Manchester and his Committees, who were charged to purge them of all error—the other counties being Essex, Suffolk, Hertford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, and Lincoln. He was instrumental in the ejection and sequestration of a large number of Norfolk clergy, and Walker complains bitterly of the inferior men who often replaced the deprived incumbents—instancing cases of a saddler, a tinker, and even a boy of but eighteen years old, though these indeed were not actually in Norfolk.¹ The sequestered parsons were entitled to a fifth of the value of the benefice for themselves and their families, but very few indeed succeeded in getting this money, viz.: seven in 1646, eight in 1647, six in 1648, and three in part of 1649.² In one famous case in Somerset, Dr. Locket, the rector of West Moncton, was refused his Fifths, the intruding

¹ See Walker, "The Sufferings of the Clergy," p. 98.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 99, 100, 103.

minister Elford asserting that he was dead, "where-upon the Dr. went in person to demand them; but Elford persisted in his refusal, and told the Dr. he was naturally alive yet he was dead in Trespasses and Sins, and therefore there was nothing due to him!"¹

The Earl of Manchester's instructions to the Committees provide for them to sit in various convenient centres in each county. In Clause II "He thinks it not fit that the party accused should be present at the taking of the Depositions," though he might have a copy of the accusations "if he pay for it," so that he can return a written reply, to be followed within fourteen days by a public defence. In Clause VI he notes with disapproval that it has been "found by sad experience that parishioners were not forward to complain of their ministers," he presses all "well affected men within every Hundred" to come forward and testify as to "the Doctrines, Lives and Conversations of all Ministers and Schoolmasters."²

It was perfectly just that cases of immorality should be ejected, but the large majority of the clergy suffered for "malignancy and superstition," some of the crimes imputed to them were "Bowling at the Name of Jesus, and towards the Altar, keeping company with Malignants, refusing to contribute to the Parliament . . . standing at the *Gloria Patri*, Reading the Second Service at the *Communion*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

² *Ibid.*, p. 117.

Table, being troubled that the Rails were pulled down, and the Table remov'd, using the *Canonical Prayer* and no other, before Sermon ; Officiating and Preaching in the *Hood* and *Surplice*, not suffering Godly men (Mr. Stephen Marshall and others named) to Preach in their Churches, Reading the Liturgy to the discomposure of Godly Mr. *Waterhouse* (lately come from *New England*) who was to preach ; Bidding the People search the Scriptures, and see there if it were lawful to take Arms against the King, or to plunder ; Charging Godfathers to carry their Children to the Bishop to be Bishop'd,"¹ and many more offences of like character. Actually only four of the Norfolk clergy appear to have been even accused of immoral or unseemly conduct.

In the year 1644 alone, 156 clergy were deprived in five of the Seven Associated Counties, viz., in Norfolk 51, Suffolk 37, Cambridgeshire 31, Essex 21, and in Lincolnshire 16. During each year which followed the numbers increased, and altogether 88 ministers *at least* suffered ejectment, sequestration or other persecution in Norfolk, and over 120 in Suffolk during this period of inquisitorial tyranny. In England and Wales the total of sequestered clergy reached the huge number of nearly 8,000, these figures being given on the authority of a boast in the House of Commons by one White, a bitter and violent Committee man, and Jeremiah Stephens,

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 119, 120.

a learned contemporary writer. To this estimate Walker adds another and more moderate one. "But the most perfect and unquestionable Account of the numbers of the *Sequester'd* Clergy, I have yet met with," says he, "seems to be that of *Dr. Gauden*, in his *Petitionary Remonstrance* . . . This *Remonstrance* was occasioned by the Protector's *Declaration* of 1655, at which time the *Sufferings of the Clergy* began to draw towards their period. The Dr. was a Person of Learning and Eminence, had been an Eye Witness of many of their Miseries, thro' every single year of their Persecution; and could not want the best Opportunities of Informing himself from many of the Sufferers themselves, concerning the Rest. The End indeed which he proposed by that *Petition* in Favour of the *Clergy* would not allow him to make the least of their Numbers: Nor, on the other Hand, would the Hazard of speaking even the Truth in such a Cause permit him to exceed in his Account; especially when he had to deal with a Person that had himself acted so great a Part in these Miseries of the Clergy, and could by so many other ways inform himself of the Facts thus laid before him.

That Learned Person therefore acquaints the Protector, that "above half of the Ministers and Scholars of *England* and *Wales* had been, upon one Account or other, SEQUESTER'D from their Livings (which are above 9,000) besides Fellowships or Free-Schools." And that "Many also had been

wholly deprived of their Prebendaries, Deaneries, Bishopricks and highest Dignities in the Church ; who upon the first Figure or Head, could not be less than SIX OR SEVEN THOUSAND PERSONS.”¹ The writer goes on to point out that with their families included, about twenty to thirty thousand persons must have been turned out of their homes. Walker further observes that no mention is made by Dr. Gauden of the numerous curates and private chaplains who were also silenced at this time, and he affirms that if these were included the total number would reach something like nine or even ten thousand.

We must, however, be careful to allow for the partisan feeling which is bound to run through contemporary writings, although we must not forget that Dr. Gauden was a Presbyterian himself, besides being the reputed author of “Eikon Basilike.”

Walker has collected an enormous amount of information respecting these “Sequestered Loyalists,” but obviously his record is in no sense a complete one, though it is certainly a very honest one, for he gives details of all cases of ejection owing to immoral behaviour, drunkenness or any other offence.

Turning now to his account of the Norfolk Clergy, it is interesting to find what a large proportion of the Cathedral dignitaries were men of learning and

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 200.

university degree ; out of a total of twelve clergy attached to the Cathedral Church five were D.D.'s, four B.D.'s, and the remaining three are described as M.A.'s. Bishop Richard Montague died in 1641. He had been an object of dislike to the Parliamentary party and had been openly accused by them in Parliament. Fortunately for him he died before worse troubles fell upon him, leaving his saintly successor, Bishop Joseph Hall,¹ to bear the brunt of the coming persecution. Shortly after his translation to the See of Norwich from that of Exeter, he was, with the other bishops, imprisoned in the Tower by Vote of Parliament. "It was at that time Very Cold and Frosty," and the month of January, Walker tells us, "and Eight of the clock at Night : To which however the House had no manner of Regard ; but without any Mercy, sent those *Reverend Old Persons* away to that Prison." Later he was released on bail of £5,000 and returned to Norwich, where he was subjected to every kind of annoyance and petty persecution. For instance, "they came to his Palace and took an *Inventory* of all his Goods, even to a *Dozen of Trenchers*, and would have inventory'd the very *wearing Clothes* of his Children and Family, had he

¹ Bishop Hall, during his episcopacy at Exeter, was accused first of favouring the Puritans, and then of taking too favourable a view of the Roman Catholic position. As a matter of fact, he was a vehement anti-papist. See "Observations on some specialities of Divine Providence in the Life of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich," written with his own hand.

not got an Order to the contrary, from some *then* in Power. These, together with his *Library*, were all exposed to Publick Sale ; but one Mrs. Goodwyn redeemed the Household Goods, paying the Full Price for them which the Sequestrators had demanded, and then leaving them with the Bishop till he could Repay her. As to his Books, they were viewed by several Stationers, but at last, one Mr. Cook, a Worthy Divine of the Diocese, gave Bond to the Sequestrators to the Full Value which they Appraised them at ; and it was paid out of the poor Pittance of Fifths which the Bishop received."

On another occasion the Palace was ransacked by a Trooper and a horse stolen, and at another time it was attacked by the mob, who had heard that the Bishop had "ordained some persons in his own Chapel."¹ Finally, they robbed him of many of his dues in money, failed to pay his Fifths, and turned him out of the house. "We might," saith he, "have lain in the Street, for ought I know, had not the Providence of God so order'd it, that a Neighbour in the Close, one Mr. Goslin, a widower, was content to void his house for us." The poor old bishop describes his sufferings in a little work entitled, "Hard Measure." Walker tells us that during all his years of persecution and poverty,

¹ In his "Hard Measure," the bishop writes, "had they known before of mine ordaining, they would have pulled me and those whom I ordained out of the chapel by the ears."

" he distributed a Weekly Charity, out of that little which was left him, to a certain number of Poor Widows ; and kept a Weekly Fast with his whole Family, for the safety of his *Majesty's Person*, until they had barbarously *murthered* him before his own *Palace-Gate*." As for Bishop Hall he did not live to see the Restoration but died in 1656 in the 82nd year of his age, after bearing his sufferings and last illness with great patience and actually foretelling the night of his own death. As Walker says, " He was a Person of *incomparable Meekness, Humility and Piety*." ¹

Many of the Cathedral dignitaries shared the same fate as their bishop, amongst them Dr. John Hassal, the Dean, formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford, and chaplain to the unfortunate Queen of Bohemia, who ended his days in extreme poverty at Creak, his circumstances being so reduced that Walker tells us "*one of his daughters*, not many years since, was maintain'd by the Charity and Relief of the Parish." The Archdeacons of Norfolk, Norwich, Suffolk and Sudbury, and seven Prebendaries were also dispossessed of their appointments. One of these latter named John Spendlow, a Prebendary of thirty years' standing, was only allowed two shillings and sixpence a week by the Sequestrators, " for which he was forced every week to wait on one *Samuel Cawthorn, a Cutler, a vile wretch*, but much in the confidence of that Party ;

¹ Walker, pp. 55, 56.

whose pleasure he was forced to attend, and often bear his insolence with a great deal of Patience, for this pitiful allowance, whereby to be *kept from Starving, all else* that he had being taken from him."

The treatment of the country clergy was equally severe. I will quote a few cases given by Walker.

Christopher Barnard, rector of Dickleborough, was dispossessed of his living in 1643, having refused the Earl of Manchester's offer to keep his benefice if he would accept the Covenant. His house and goods were plundered and he, himself, carried off towards Norwich Castle, "but he had by his excellent life and Doctrine so much recommended himself to his Parishioners, that as they thought a greater judgment could not befall them than to lose him; so by consent they followed the Party which had him in Custody, and rescued him. They also gave this further testimony of their Affection to him, that when the Villains had designed to Plunder his House a second Time; unknown to him they voluntarily went, and by force secur'd the remainder of the Goods in their own Houses; and even the very Women and Children assisted in this perilous Undertaking, to the manifest Hazard of their Safety, and perhaps of their Lives, if it had been discover'd. He had at the time of his Sufferings, a Wife and at least Nine young Children, which helped to compleat his Misery." Christopher Barnard was one of the first ministers to be restored at the return of Charles

II, and died at the ripe old age of eighty-three, having been rector of Dickleborough for close on sixty years.¹

At Swannington the ejected Minister was the Reverend Edmund Duncon, who at a later date was rector of Friern Barnet, in Middlesex. It was this Duncon who, in 1670, was the messenger between the saintly Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding, and his dear friend George Herbert, who then lay sick of his last illness. Mr. Duncon brought away with him as a parting gift from Herbert to Ferrar the priceless MS. of poems, afterwards published under the title of "The Temple." The whole story is told at length in Walton's "Life of George Herbert," and has been retold in the recent "History of Swannington," by the Reverend Dixon Wortley.

Mr. Stephen Hurry, or Harry, of Alburgh in Earsham Hundred, was turned out by the Earl of Manchester in 1644, "for being strict in Observing the Orders of the Church himself, and pressing them on others, when *Rural Dean*; for saying, Women ought to be Church'd in a Veil; for Vindicating the *Ceremonies* of the Church, the Validity of an *Evil Minister's* office, and the *Book of Sports*; for speaking against the *Scots*, and Mr. *Dodd's Works*; for Stopping his Sermon when he saw any with their Hats on; for being Distemper'd with Drink; for telling a Woman, who designed to give her Ring for the Parliament Service, that she might Chance

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

to have a *Rope* for it ; and several other Instances of *Malignity*. At the time of his Death, he gave Legacies to *Forty Sequestered Ministers*.”¹ Another parson, Richard Kendal, of Santon and Downham, was accused amongst other heinous crimes of calling the Puritans hypocrites², whilst several others were called to account for swearing by their faith or troth !

The Rectors of Rockland St. Peter, Rockland St. Andrew, and Rockland All Saints were all ejected from their livings, for a variety of causes. The Reverend John Lethwaite of Rockland St. Peter, for example, was sequestered in 1644, “ because he had not been able to *Read* or *Preach* a long time, by reason of an *Impediment* in his *mouth* ; and also for observing the Orders of the Church ; *wearing a square Cap with a Tossel on the Crown* ; *Denying Godly Ministers* to Preach in his *Pulpit* ; Keeping a Curate who had been Imprisoned for his *Loyalty* ; speaking many honest Truths, and Neglecting to tender the *Covenant* to his Parish. He had a wife and six children ; but they were Grown up.”³ His brother of Rockland St. Andrew, Thomas Watts, was also turned out in 1644, his crimes being that he read his sermons, scandalized the godly by saying that “ the Troopers who *Stole the Common Prayer Book out of his Church*, were *Sacriligious Rogues*, inveighing against People wandering from their *Parish Church*, swearing by

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

² *Ibid.*, p. 288.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

Faith and Troth," and so on. So he and his wife and five children had to go, losing not only the income of the living but also a private estate of £100 a year.¹

Again, take the ill-treatment meted out to the Reverend Thomas Reeve, of Aldborough, who was Sequestered by the Earl of Manchester, in 1643. His own son tells the tale as follows :

" One Major Raims [of Overstrand], his Neighbour, having Raised a *Troop of Horse* for the *Parliament*, got a Warrant from the *Committee of Sequestration* at *Norwich*, to take away the said Dr. *Reeve's Cattle*, and to bring *him* Prisoner to *Norwich Jayl*: Which he Executed with all the Rigour he could ; searching the Bed where the wife of the said Dr. *Reeve* had *layn in but three Days*, for the said Dr. *Reeve*: And when the Women rebuked him for his Barbarity ; telling him he acted more like a *Beast* than *Man* ; he drew his Sword, and stabb'd it through the *Bed* in several Places, pretending to stabb the said Dr. *Reeve* as hid in the *Bed*. After that, he caused all his *Troopers* to pull the *Bridles* off their *Horses*, and whip them round the Garden, to Tread all under foot. After that, he broke open the *Barn-Door*, and turned the *whole Troop* to the *Sacks of Corn* to fill their Bellies. Some few Days later he came with *another Warrant*, and brake open the Doors with a *Plow-Share*, being denied Possession, and turned

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 401.

my *Mother* and *Six Children* into the *Street* ; and brought *Carts*, and carried away my *Father's Library*, and all the *Household Goods*, and sold them for what he pleas'd, and gave no account to the *Committee*. Then my *Father*, (having lain obscure for near *three years*) attempted to go to *Oxford* to the *King* ; and within *seven miles* of that *Place* was taken *Prisoner* by a *Troop* of the *Parliament Horse*, and stript *Naked* in very *Cold Weather*, and his *Clothes* ripp'd all in *Pieces* to search for *Letters* ; instead of which, they met with near *Three score Pieces of Broad Gold*, which were quilted into several *Places*, for his *Support* ; but he could get none of them again. Then he was brought *Prisoner* to *London*, where his country-man *Miles Corbet* (who was afterwards one of *King Charles the First's Judges*) sate *Chairman* of the *Committee* ; who pretended at first to send him in *Exchange* to *Oxford* ; but after that, told him, he knew him to be an *Old Malignant*, and promised to see him *Hanged* ; so sent him *Prisoner* to the *Gate-House, Westminster*, where he was very *hardly used* for *Three Years*." The end of his troubles came in 1652, when after strenuous efforts on the part of Mrs. Reeve he was released and the Sequestration removed.¹

Very sad too was the case of Thomas Campbell, rector of Swafield, who after his ejection in 1643, retired to a poor Cottage at Bradfield, where he was

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 345, 346.

visited by a friend, "an ancient clergyman" . . . "in a Season of very cold Frost and deep snow. He found him in his Study reading 'Gerhard's Harmony.' He had with him at that time a Wife and Four Children, without Fire or Firing. This Clergyman being weary and dry with his Walk, took the Freedom to ask for a Draught of Beer : upon which Mr. *Campbell* took him to the Window, and pointing to a little Rill which ran by the House, told him he might go there and drink as much as he pleased ; for that himself he had no other Liquor to drink for some months past. After which his Friend asked for something to Eat ; to which Mr. *Campbell* reply'd, that he had neither *Bread*, nor *Butter*, nor *Cheese*, nor *Fish*, nor *Flesh* in his House ; and that he had wanted *all these*, and *Firing* also, for many Weeks : But leading him to an old Churn, and opening it, he shew'd him two or three *Puddings*, which, he said, were made of Barley (and indeed their Colour and the Coarseness of their Looks abundantly confirm'd it ;) upon which (as hard and cold as Frost could make them) and Water, Mr. *Campbell* assur'd his Friend he had liv'd for some time." His friend adds a comment on the "Heroical *Christian Bravery*" and "elated Sprightliness" of the bearing and conversation of this sufferer, who in his young days had been a soldier under Gustavus Adolphus.¹

I must not weary you with too many instances of

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 222, 223.

individual hardship and persecution, but there are still one or two sufferers who ought not to be overlooked. Mr. Tenison of Mundesley, whose son became Archbishop of Canterbury, John Watson of Kirby Cane, and Henry Watts, of Wheatacre, two Scots, who being "first plundered in Scotland," escaped to England to avoid the Covenant, only to find the same fate awaiting them here, and lastly we must not forget Thomas Cooper, rector of Edgefield and schoolmaster of Holt, who was tried at Norwich on Christmas Day, 1650, "for being concern'd in a *Rising* in favour of his Majesty." He was condemned on purely presumptive evidence, extorted from a fellow prisoner named William Hobart, and was executed before his own School door. Hobart in the end shared his fate, in spite of the promise of pardon offered to him in return for his evidence against Cooper.¹

The gaps in the ranks of the Ministry due to the sequestrations and ejectments were filled by persons who had been duly approved by the "Triers," men appointed by the State to sit at Whitehall and examine the various candidates for benefices. They "were most Independents," Calamy tells us, "but had some Presbyterians joined with them, and had power to try all who came for institution or induction; without whose approbation none were admitted. They themselves examined all who were able to come up to London; but if any

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

were unable, or of doubtful qualifications, they referred them to some ministers in the county where they lived." By this means an attempt was made to fill the vacant benefices with Puritan and Independent Ministers and preachers, the majority being unepiscopally ordained.

It does not appear to me, however, that *all* the sequestered livings were filled but rather that one minister often had the charge of several parishes, and this would to a certain extent account for the comparatively small number of ministers ejected in 1662. Frequently in Calamy's accounts of ministers they are described as preaching to congregations in different villages, and an examination of parish registers often reveals the fact that marriages and burials were solemnized by ministers from neighbouring places, or from the nearest market town, pointing to the fact that the parish had no resident minister.

The earlier spiritual aims and ideals of the Puritans were grievously weakened by persistent and bitter political activity, and at the time of Cromwell's death in 1658, their party was in a state of disintegration. Less than two years later, on May 1st, 1660, Parliament voted for the return of the King, and deputed Dr. Calamy, Dr. Manton, Mr. Bowles, and others to attend him from Holland. "His Majesty gave them such encouraging promises, as raised in some of them very high expectations. When he made his entrance, May 29th, 1660, as

he passed thro' the city towards Westminster, the London ministers, in their places, attended him with acclamations, and by the hands of old Mr. Arthur Jackson, presented him with a richly-adorned Bible ; which he received, telling them ' It should be the rule of his government and of his life.' " Vain hopes and vain words ushering in the reign of Charles II !

Bishop Burnet has given us a brilliant portrait of the King at the time of the Restoration. " The King was then thirty Years of Age, and past, one would think, the levities of Youth, and extravagances of Pleasure. He had a good Understanding ; was well acquainted with the State of Affairs both at home and abroad ; and had an easy affability, and softness of Temper, that charmed all that came near him, until they were made sensible how little his good Looks, and kind Words, and fair Promises, wherein he was liberal to excess, were to be depended on. His Apprehension was quick, and his Imagination and Memory good, which enabled him to tell Stories with a good Grace ; but these being sometimes too long, and sometimes too often repeated, made him become an everlasting Talker. His compass of Knowledge was very considerable ; for he understood Physick and Chymistry, Mechanicks and Navigation well ; and the Architecture of a Ship, a little more exactly than what became a Prince. His sense of Religion was so very small, that he did not so much as affect the Hypocrite ;

but, at Prayers and Sacrament, let every one, by his negligent Behaviour, see how little he thought himself concerned in these matters. His Popery he concealed to the last. . . . His political Notions were chiefly taken from the *French* Government ; for a King that might be controuled, or have his Ministers called to an account by Parliament, was, in his opinion, but a Creature of the People, and a King by name. His private opinion of People was very odd : he thought no Man sincere and no Woman honest, out of Principle ; but that whenever they proved so, Humour or Vanity was at the bottom of it : No one, he fancied, served him out of Love, and therefore he endeavoured to be quits with the World, by loving others as little as, he thought they loved him."

Such was the King whom Dr. Calamy and his companions were sent to welcome.

No time was lost in re-establishing the episcopal Church, Juxon being made Archbishop of Canterbury (chiefly for the reason that he had ministered to the late king in his last hours), while Sheldon was made Bishop of London, a man, Burnet tells us, of "great Quickness in Apprehension, a true Judgment, a Dexterity in Business, and a Pleasantness in Conversation, perhaps too great!" Edward Reynolds became Bishop of Norwich, a man with a chequered history. He began his ministry as preacher to Lincoln's Inn, and in 1631 was rector of Braunston, in Northamptonshire. In 1642,

however, he appears to have altered his views, and he became a Presbyterian, and in 1643 he took the Covenant. Five years later Parliament conferred upon him a D.D. degree and made him Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. A further change in his opinions occurred and he got into trouble for refusing to take the Engagement accepting the Commonwealth, as established without King or House of Lords. Finally Reynolds was one of those who pressed for a royalist restoration, doubtless getting the bishopric of Norwich as his reward. Sir Thomas Browne describes him as a man of "singular affability, meekness and humility, of great learning, a frequent preacher, and a Constant resident at his episcopal palace."

There must have been a feeling of great unsettlement in Church matters in the early days of Charles II, and the Savoy Conference in 1661 did much to clear the air. Bishop Collins affirms that the Reformation only reached its completion at the Savoy Conference, where, "for the first time the puritans were brought face to face with the now fully matured position of the English Church." We will not enter here into the controversial points of their discussion—Prayer Book revision, the validity of non-episcopal ordination, and so on (which remain points of controversy to the present day). Enough to say that those in authority determined to enforce the order and discipline of the Anglican Church as they understood it. The

Act of Uniformity was passed compelling ministers to accept the Book of Common Prayer and to use no other prayers at *Service time* (although at *any other time* it was lawful to use any psalm or prayer taken from the Bible). Kneeling at the Holy Communion was again insisted upon, and an attempt was made to return to the Church ritual prevailing before the Civil War. Ministers were given until St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24th, 1662, to conform to the regulations or leave their benefices. Those of the "Sequestered Loyalists" who survived had returned to their own again. Automatically and without any legislation they claimed that which had illegally been taken away from them. Bishops and priests alike were competent to resume their offices so soon as the "tyranny was overpast." The Elizabethan Act of Uniformity of 1559 would have been sufficient for the removal of unepiscopally ordained and otherwise Nonconforming ministers. The Act of 1662 reiterated its principles and insisted upon conformity to its provisions before August 24th, 1662—nearly two years after the return of Charles II. The intruding ministers had had time to consider their position, and although the time allowed before the actual enforcement of the Act was hardly long enough to enable them to master its contents, yet at the same time it must have been obvious to them from the first that they could not hold Church livings and not obey Church laws.

A large number must have conformed judging by

the *comparatively* small number of "Bartholomew Sufferers." Calamy claims that there were not less than two thousand who were ready to leave their livings for the sake of their Nonconformity (although he only enumerates eight hundred). On the other hand other authorities state that Calamy greatly over-estimates the number and that eight hundred represents practically the whole number of ministers actually ejected.¹

We have already seen that the Presbyterian Reynolds conformed and became Bishop of Norwich. Calamy and the saintly Baxter were offered and refused the bishoprics of Lichfield and Hereford. They, and a large number of their Nonconforming brethren preferred to leave all rather than accept the Act of Uniformity, which was a violation of their conscientious beliefs. Many Puritan clergy did indeed conform, and it is striking to see the resolute way in which the Puritans "struggled against the making of divisions in the Church." They were keenly anxious to avoid schism, and many even of those who were deprived at "Black Bartholomew" did not therefore secede, but became, like Baxter himself, a "Nonconformist minister but a conformist parishioner."

The "Sequestered Loyalists" were enjoying peace once more; it was now the turn of the "Bartholomew Sufferers." The King had declared at

¹ See Curteis, "Bampton Lectures," 1871, quoted by Dr. Pickard in the "Eastern Daily Press," Nov. 28th, 1921.

Breda, on April 4th, 1660, "a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted, or called in question, for differences of opinion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." Good and tolerant words doubtless, but they did not help to ameliorate the fate of the Dissenting ministers. Both politicians and Churchmen were determined that they must conform, or go.

Let us look at the effect of "Black Bartholomew" in Norfolk. According to Calamy, and his editor, Palmer, sixty-six ministers refused to comply with the provisions of the Act of Uniformity and were, therefore, ejected from their livings. (Evidently a good number of those who had been in the possession of sequestered benefices must have conformed in 1662, for we have already seen that eighty-eight loyalists had been dispossessed in Norfolk, although it is quite possible that *all* had not been replaced by nominees of the Parliament.)

In Norwich itself six Nonconformists had to quit their parishes, several of them notable men in their way. Dr. John Collinges, of St. Stephen's, "was a man of great worth and reputation; of general learning, signal piety, and eminent ministerial abilities, which rendered him a blessing to the City of Norwich for above forty years." He was one of the commissioners at the Savoy Conference, where "he was very desirous of accommodation, but in vain." Another notable Norwich minister was Thomas Allen, of St. George's, who had

been born in Norwich in 1608. He first held the living of St. Edmond's, but was silenced by Bishop Wren in 1636, for refusing to read the "Book of Sports," and fled to New England, only returning about 1651. He was a Congregationalist or Independent, and a famous preacher, and continued to preach in Norwich until his death in 1673.

Benjamin Snowden, of St. Giles's, also refused to conform, although he had received Anglican Orders at the hands of Bishop Hall. Calamy tells us "love to God and man possessed his heart . . . his whole conversation spake quietness and peace. In every condition he shewed a just equanimity ; and passed so inoffensively thro' the world, as scarcely to have an enemy."

Other ministers ejected in Norwich were Francis English from St. Nicholas, Enoch Woodward from St. George's, and Mr. John Hasbart, "a very rousing awakening preacher." Three ministers were removed from Lynn, the most notable being John Horne, vicar of All Hallows. Calamy tells us that he was "very laborious in his private capacity after he was cast out of his living. He went constantly to church, and yet preached thrice at his house every Lord's day ; first, in the morning before church-time, again after dinner, and in the evening. . . . He was a man of such great charity, that he commonly emptied his pocket of what money he had in it among the poor, when he went into the town, giving to any such miserable object

as presented, the first piece of silver that came to hand. . . . The circumstances of his marriage were particular. Three young women, who were sisters, coming to hear him preach at *Hareby*, a village near *Bullingbroke*, in Lincolnshire, the clerk after sermon insinuating himself into their company, took the liberty to ask them which of them would like such a man as *Mr. Horne* for her husband? The two elder, though they could not but commend his preaching, exclaimed against such a connection, and urged as a reason, the poor circumstances in which ministers' widows were often left: but the younger said she would think herself happy if she might but have such a man, though she begged her bread with him. This was carried to *Mr. Horne*, and he married her. She survived him, but never wanted while she lived."

Turning to Yarmouth, we find that four ministers refused to conform, viz., two Presbyterians and two Independents. One of the former, the Reverend John Brinsley, was nephew to Bishop Hall, his mother being sister to the Bishop. He accompanied his uncle, then Dean of Worcester, to the Synod of Dort, as his secretary, and later on held various livings, including that of Somerleyton. He was invited to come and minister in Yarmouth by the townspeople, but was greatly hindered by Bishop Harsnet, of Norwich, and eventually took to preaching "at a country village in the island of Lotherland," whither people flocked to hear him

from Yarmouth and elsewhere. He returned to Yarmouth during the Commonwealth and remained there to the end of his life, living in retirement after his refusal to conform in 1662.

William Bridge, the Independent, was another well-known Yarmouth preacher, and a man of great industry and learning. "He was a very hard student : rose at four o'clock winter and summer, and continued in his study till eleven. Many souls heartily bless God for his labours." Yet another Yarmouth minister was Job Tookie, formerly preacher at St. Alban's Abbey and leader of a group of Congregationalists there. He was one of the very few Norfolk Nonconformists who suffered imprisonment and in his case it was only for a day ! He is to be remembered for his beautiful saying : "Prayer is the arrow ; love the bow that sends it forth ; and faith the hand that draws the bow ; but when the bow is not strong, or the hand feeble that draws it, the arrow must needs fall short of the mark."

Many of the country ministers were equally worthy men. At Baconsthorpe, the Reverend John Lougher, who had been ordained by Bishop Reynolds, is described as "a man of great moderation, of a catholic spirit, and a diffusive charity, much beloved and respected by serious persons of all denominations. He, with many others, was imprisoned, about the time of *Monmouth's* landing, when he contracted an illness from

which he never recovered. In other respects he had no trouble ; for he had such favour among his neighbours, that his meetings were never broken up." On leaving his benefice, he laboured for many years as Congregational minister at South Repps and Alby.

John Butler, of Feltwell, another good man, made a journey to Smyrna after his ejection, finally dying at Ipswich in his 84th year.

At Barningham, Thomas Worts was deprived and imprisoned, while his brother Richard Worts was likewise removed from Foulsham. The latter was cruelly imprisoned in the common jail at Norwich, from November, 1664, until the following February, when " he, with six more, was put into the castle, in a narrow hole in the wall, which had neither door, window, nor chimney ; and only room for one truckle bed, the others lay in hammocks." The plague was then raging, but in spite of the contagion and their other ill treatment, the prisoners lived to regain their freedom, though Richard Worts had to wait in prison for seven years !

At Mundesley, Paul Amyraut had ministered to the parish after the ejection of Mr. Tenison. He was not of British origin but was born in the Palatinate, and was for several years vicar of East Dereham. He was a student of the works of Luther, and a writer on the same subject. Another member of the same family, Christopher Amyraut, was ejected from the living of New Buckenham,

afterwards going to Baconsthorpe. He ended his days as a preacher at South Repps and in the vicinity, his three children, Rebekah, Caleb and Christopher being buried (1691 and 1692) in the old Churchyard at Sidestrand.

The case of the Reverend Miles Burkitt, of Neatishead and Irstead, is curious, for he had only been appointed to the benefices by the Puritan Bishop Reynolds three months, before he was ejected for nonconformity under the Act of Uniformity.

Richard Lawrence, of Trunch, the son of a Cambridgeshire gentleman, enjoyed the unusual distinction of being a member of both universities, having started his college career at St. John's College, Cambridge, and completed it at Oxford. After his ejection from Trunch, he and his wife and six children left England, and for some time he was pastor of a church at Amsterdam. He was disabled from work for six years before his death in 1702, and on the day of his death, November 17th, he said to one of his daughters, "Now, child, flesh and heart fail : but " (raising his voice considerably) "God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever."¹

These were some of the men who suffered for conscience sake in Norfolk in the seventeenth

¹ For the detailed account of the "Bartholomew Sufferers" in Norfolk, see "The Nonconformists' Memorial," Vol. III, pp. 1-23.

century, and we read the history of their constancy and sufferings with admiration and respect. Looking back from the distance of a hundred and forty years and more, we can free ourselves from the bitter partisan spirit which clouded the vision of contemporary writers. Walker wished to prove that the "Sequestered Loyalists" were the greatest sufferers; Calamy that the "Bartholomew Sufferers" had the most to bear. On the face of the evidence of numbers and ill treatment Walker appears to us to have made good his case for the Anglican clergy, and moreover their persecution was absolutely unjustifiable, both legally and spiritually, for the Church could not be overthrown and the whole character of its constitution and ministry be changed at the will of an erastian Parliamentary party. The case of the ejected ministers of 1662 is not a parallel one to that of the Anglican clergy, for they had been illegally intruded into the offices and benefices of another religious body through the action of the State. I fail to understand why the hard treatment of the "Bartholomew Sufferers" has called forth so much sympathy from historians and from the general public, while the fate of the "Sequestered Loyalists" under the Commonwealth has been barely commented upon. Historical fairness compels us to look most carefully into both sides of a question and to try to keep clear of partisan bitterness. We can, in this case, appreciate the religious conviction which made men

of both parties ready to suffer for what they believed to be the truth ; we can with equal certainty condemn the one-sided tyranny of the Commonwealth which left no room for liberty of conscience, and at the same time deplore all that was bitter and revengeful in the legislation of the restored royalists. The conclusion of the matter seems to me to be a feeling of real thankfulness that we were not called upon to be either Churchmen or Nonconformists in the seventeenth century, and that our own day finds us living in a land where religious toleration has become almost a matter of course, and where we are free to worship God in either Church or Chapel according to our own personal needs.

APPENDIX

A Summary of the Lists taken from Walker's "Sufferings of the Clergy" and Calamy's "Nonconformists' Memorial" giving the names of all Norfolk clergy and ministers ejected under the Commonwealth and in 1662.

SINCE it is the delight of the local historian to happen upon information relating to his own parish or district, I have thought it worth while to transcribe all the entries from the above works dealing with Norfolk parishes and ministers, as it is not always easy to obtain access to the original books.

SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS taken from Walker,
1714 ed.

NORWICH CATHEDRAL DIGNITARIES:

1. HALL, Joseph, D.D., Bishop of NORWICH. Walker gives a very full account of his sufferings, a portion of which is given on page 36.
2. HASSAL, John, D.D., Dean of NORWICH from 1628. Formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford, and Chaplain to the Queen of Bohemia. See p. 38.
3. BING, Andrew, D.D., Archdeacon of NORWICH.
4. WHITE, Robert, B.D., Archdeacon of NORFOLK from 1631, and of Eaton, Hunts.
5. KENT¹, Theophilus, M.A., Archdeacon of SUDBURY from 1621.
6. MILESON, Richard, M.A., Archdeacon of SUFFOLK from 1640, and Prebend of Chichester, formerly chaplain to Bishop Montague. "He was forced beyond the Seas by the Rebellion, where he quitted the *Communion* of the *Church of England* for that of *Rome*."
7. SPENDLOW, John, M.A., appointed 1616. See p. 38.
8. ROBERTS, Foulk, B.D., of Cambridge University. A learned man who published several books on Tithes, etc. He was incumbent of ST. CLEMENT'S, "and constantly preached there every Sunday till sequestr'd." He died before the Restoration.
9. HOWLET, Nicholas, D.D., appointed 1618, died before the Restoration.
10. GAREY, Samuel, B.D., appointed 1620, and died "somewhat distracted" before the Restoration.

¹ Nos. 5 and 6 are really Suffolk clergy, but I have included them with the diocesan dignitaries in the same way that Walker has done. East Suffolk formed part of the diocese of Norwich until 1913. The parochial clergy of Suffolk I have been obliged to omit through lack of space.

11. PORTER, Edmund, D.D., appointed 1627, also rector of HEVINGHAM. He published various books, and "was a man of great dexterity in managing the Business of the Church." He lived until 1670.
12. YOUNG, Edward, D.D.

THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY.

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
13. ANGUISH, Richard, sequestered by the Earl of Manchester, 1644, for being a pluralist and for preaching loyalty to the King.	STARSTON and (?) STARING.
14. BARNARD, Christopher. (See p. 39.)	DICKLE- BOROUGH.
15. BARWICK, William.	HEMPNALL.
16. BISSING, Thomas.	ICKBURGH.
17. BLOFIELD, Robert. "He was, also, horribly Reviled, Abused, Imprisoned, Plunder'd, and had his Temporal Estate likewise put under sequestration. He had at that time a wife and seven children, the eldest of which did not much exceed Eight Years of Age. His Losses in all were computed at 2000L. He survived the usurpation, and was re-instated in both his Livings."	THORPE and WESTWICK.
18. BLOFIELD, Thomas. "He had a wife and five children."	AXLENTON (? ASLACTON).
19. BOTOLPH, Thomas.	LARLING OF LARLINGFORD and HECKINGHAM.

62 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
20. BRETTON, John. "He had a Wife and Eight children."	E. DEREHAM.
21. BROOKE, Matthew, D.D. Accused in London of Blasphemy for having said "That the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God," etc.	YARMOUTH.
22. BROWN, —.	FOULSHAM.
23. BROWN, —, D.D.	WESTON-LONG-VILLE.
24. BROWN, Nathaniel.	HUNWORTH.
25. BURTON, Henry, appointed 1620.	FOULSHAM and THEMELTHORPE.
26. CAMPBELL, Thomas. (See p. 43.)	SWAFIELD.
27. CARTER, Stephen.	HORSFORD.
28. CATHERALL, Edward.	"LARBRUCK" for CARBROOKE.
29. CATLIN (CATLYN), Thomas, appointed in 1618 by Sir Nicholas Bacon.	BRINTON.
30. CLAPHAMSON, Robert. "He was very Ancient at the time of his Sequestration," for he had been appointed rector in 1597 by Sir Edward Clere.	BOUGHTON and HAMWORTH (for HANWORTH).
31. CLAXTON, Hammon. "I find one of this name sent for into custody by the <i>House of Commons</i> but I cannot say he is the same person."	HOLT and ROLLESBY.
COLEBY, —, D.D., inserted here by Dr. Walker, probably should be included in the Suffolk List, and I believe the Parishes should be	LAUSTON and ELDEN.
	LEISTON and ELVEDON.

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
32. COOPER, Thomas, and Schoolmaster of HOLT, hanged before his own school-door on Christmas Day, 1650, for being concerned in a Royalist Rising. (See p. 45.)	EDGEFIELD.
33. CRANSHAY, Thomas. He had a wife and ten young children, was very poor, and after sequestration "was with this Numerous Family turned a-Begging."	HARDWICK.
34. DAVENPORT, Richard. Sequestered before 1650 he lived to the Restoration.	FELTWELL ST. NICHOLAS.
35. DAVY, John.	WRENINGHAM.
36. DOBBS, Edward. "Forc'd to fly to His Majesty's Army."	GREAT SNORING.
37. DUNCON, Edmond. The friend of Nicholas Ferrar. (See p. 40.)	SWANNINGTON.
38. DUNNE, Daniel. "He had a wife and six children."	FELTHORPE.
39. EATON, William. (Dr. Walker here states that the vicarage of LITTLE was also sequestered, although the name of the ejected minister was not in his possession.)	DRAYTON. ELLINGHAM
40. FAWCETT, George.	BESSINGHAM.
41. FLICK, Nathaniel. "One of both these names was Fellow of Corpus Christi College in Cambridge and Proctor in 1622." Ejected in 1644 for "observing the Orders of the Church," etc.	HARDINGHAM (and CREETING in Suffolk).
42. FORTH, John.	SWAINSTHORPE.

64 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
43. FRANKLIN, Edward, D.D. "Persecuted with the utmost hardships from Place to Place," he died of injuries sustained in escaping from some soldiers, leaving a wife and four children. (Dr. Walker gives the name of —. FLINT, whom he believes was also ejected from "somewhere in the diocese of Norwich." He also notes that the rectory of was sequestered. Rouse Clapton had been appointed rector there in 1638, Blomefield).	GT. and LITTLE CRESSINGHAM.
44. GILL, Nathaniel.	GARVESTON
45. GREENWOOD, John, D.D., "well nigh Ruined for his great Loyalty." (Dr. Walker here gives an account of Dr. GURNEY, ejected from "somewhere as I conjecture, about <i>Norfolk</i> or <i>Suffolk</i> . An Ancient Lady, Grand-daughter to Bishop Hall, hath told me, that she very well remembers a Reverend old Gentleman, whom they called <i>Dr. Gurney</i> , came often to visit her Grandfather under his <i>afflictions</i> ; and added, that he had been himself a <i>Sufferer</i> and <i>Sequestered</i> , somewhere as she conjectures, about one of the two <i>forementioned counties</i> . There is one	BURGH and AYLSHAM. BRAMPTON.

*Name of Incumbent.**Parish.*

Edmond Gurney mentioned by *Fuller*; who was *Beneficed* in *Norfolk*, and died, as he saith, in the beginning of the Wars. If *Fuller* be more exact in the account of this Gentleman's death, than he is of a great many others, his *Edmond Gurney* must have been a different Person from this *Sufferer*; for it was some time after 1650 that this Lady saw him. Besides, I do not perceive by *Fuller* that this Gentleman was D.D. not to mention *Fuller's* silence as to his *Sufferings*; because he was apt enough to conceal them, though he had known them.")

46. HARRY or HURRY, Stephen. (See p. 40.)

(Dr. Walker here notes the sequestration of the rectories of

but see No. 73).

47. HATLEY, Christopher.

48. HEMBLING, John.

49. HINSON, John.

50. HOWES, Richard.

ALBURGH (in Earsham Hundred).

HACKFORD-
CUM - WHIT
WELL,

MORNING-
THORPE.

HICKLING and
PALLING.

TERRINGTON
ST. CLEMENT'S
and St. JOHN.
KNAPTON.

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
51. KENDAL, Richard. Ejected in 1644 for "observing the Orders of the Church," malignancy and saying that the "Puritans were Hypocrites."	SANTON, and the "STIPEND of DOWNHAM."
52. LENEAVE (or LE NEVE) Robert, appointed 1638 and lived to be restored.	SCOTTOW.
53. LETHWAITE, John. (See p. 41.)	ROCKLAND ST. PETER & STOW.
54. LOCK, William.	BURWELL (? for BAWDESWELL).
55. LOCK, —, D.D.	"in NORWICH."
56. LUBBIT (? LUBBOCK), Richard.	SWANTON ABBOT.
57. LUSHINGTON, Thomas, D.D., Prebendary of Bemister Secunda, in Salisbury Cathedral, a man of great learning, died 1661.	BURNHAM-WESTGATE.
58. MERYWEATHER, —. "He had a Wife and Six Children."	STRATTON St. MICHAEL and TASBURGH.
59. MOOR (or MOORSE, according to Blomefield) John, appointed in 1631.	WESTON.
60. MORTON, William.	W. LEXHAM and ROUGHAM.
61. PIKE (PEEKE, Blomefield), John. Appointed in 1601 and ejected about 1644, for "paying obedience to the <i>Orders</i> of the Church ; pressing the <i>Necessity of Parochial Communion</i> ; and being dis-tempered with <i>Drink</i> . He had	ROCKLAND ALL SAINTS.

Name of Incumbent.

been *Minister* of this *Living* 40 years, and was at *that time* so old that he could not *attend the Committee.*"

62. PLUMMER, Richard. Sequestered in 1643 for "being a loose Intemperate man, seldom *Preaching* . . . and for Assisting his *Majesty.*"

(PORTER, Edmond, B.D., Prebend. of NORWICH, q.v. No. II.

63. REEVE, Thomas. (See p. 42.)

64. RIGGS, Charles.

(ROBERTS, Foulk, B.D., Prebend. of NORWICH, q.v. No. 8.

65. SCAMBLER, John.

66. SHEPPARD, Barnabas.

67. SHEPHERD, Nicholas. "Also *Plundered and often Imprisoned.* During his *Troubles* he contracted so many Debts for the support of himself and his Family, that on his death his *Goods were seized,* his widow *utterly deprived of all maintenance,* and *reduced to great Necessity.* She was at last relieved by the *Charity* of the *Corporation for Ministers' Widows.*"

68. SHERWOOD, Nicholas. Ejected by Manchester about 1643, "for *Preaching* but once a Day, and saying that those who *Preached*

Parish.

ALBY, and curate of SUS-
TEAD.

HEVINGHAM).

ALDBOROUGH
(in N. Erping-
ham Hundred)
and COLEBY.

THWAITE.

ST. CLEMENT,
NORWICH).

RACKHEATH.

RANWORTH.

KIRBY BEDON.

EARSHAM.

68 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
<i>twice Prated once ; for Observing the Orders of the Church ; more particularly for Using the Canonical Prayer ; as likewise for several Instances of Malignancy " ; besides a gamester, swearer and scandalous person.</i>	
69. SLYN, Richard. Imprisoned for malignancy at the age of 66.	BINHAM.
70. SMITH, Thomas.	LAKENHAM and Curate of St. THOMAS, NORWICH.
71. STAINES, Nicholas. (Dr. Walker here inserts Henry Starling, rector of "HAMERSFIELD," evidently HOMERSFIELD in Suffolk. This worthy was forced to fly and died on a voyage to Virginia, leaving a widow in great poverty).	FILBY.
72. STOKES, Thomas. Turned out by Manchester, 1644, " for <i>Absence ; keeping an Insufficient Curate ; Observing the Rules of the Church ; Refusing to contribute to the Rebellion ; and being an Ale-House-Haunter.</i> "	CARLETON-RODE and HEIGHAM (? for HINGHAM).
73. SYMONDS, Thomas, appointed 1637 (Blomefield), lived to be restored.	HACKFORD and WHITWELL.
74. TALBOT, —.	METTON.
75. TAYLOR, Richard. " Turned out for <i>Delinquency.</i> "	STANFIELD.

*Name of Incumbent.**Parish.*

76. TENISON, John. "He was succeeded by one *Gubbard*, who was sometime afterwards discovered to be a *Roman* Catholick, and again dismissed by the same Committee at Norwich, who at first Thrust him into the Living. The present Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, is son to this worthy *Sufferer*."

MUNDESLEY.

77. TENISON, Phillip. "There was a *Gentleman* of both these Names made *Archdeacon* of *Norfolk*, immediately upon the *Restoration*; which I take to have been the same person with the *Sequestered Minister* of this Living, and a Different one from that Tenison already mentioned."

HETHERSETT.

A. Phillip Tenison, S.T.R., died rector of FOULSHAM in 1660 (Blomefield).

78. TITE, Robert.

ST. JULIAN'S,
NORWICH.

(Dr. Walker here inserts the sequestered Parishes of but without the name of the ejected minister. Henry Waite had been instituted to the Vicarage in 1639. Blomefield.)

TUNSTEAD and
SCO' RUSTON.

79. TUBBING, Thomas.

BAYFIELD.

80. WARD, John. "He had a Wife and Four Children."

LITTLE

ELLINGHAM.

81. WATSON, John, M.A. An exile from Scotland. (See p. 45.)

KIRBY-CANE.

70 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Name of Incumbent.</i>	<i>Parish.</i>
82. WATTS, Henry. Also from Scotland.	WHEATACRE ALL SAINTS and WHEATACRE ST. PETER.
83. WATTS, Thomas. (See p. 41.)	ROCKLAND ST. ANDREW.
84. WAYTE (or WAYKS, Blomefield). His family was reduced to great poverty.	NORTH WOOT- TON.
85. WILLIAMS, Hugh. "A <i>Learned</i> and very <i>Holy Person</i> . He was <i>Se-</i> <i>questered</i> , for Preaching often on a <i>malignant Psalm</i> , viz., the 79th, ' <i>O God, the Heathen are come into</i> <i>Thine Inheritance, etc.</i> ' They might <i>Quarrel</i> with him for his <i>Holiness</i> , but <i>Evil</i> they could not find in him. After he was <i>Se-</i> <i>questered</i> , <i>Cromwell</i> suppressed him from Teaching <i>Grammar</i> to a few <i>boys</i> at Low-Layton, in <i>Essex</i> ."	FORNCETT.
86. WILSON, Thomas.	FULMODESTON.
87. WYTHER, —, D.D. "He was a very great <i>Sufferer</i> ."	POSTWICK.
CURATES EJECTED.	
(COLEBY, Daniel, curate to Dr. COLEBY, q.v. "He had a Wife and Four Children." Probably in Suffolk.)	
88. DISPLIN, Thomas. "He had a Wife and Four Children."	Curate of ST. SEPULCHRE'S, NORWICH.

NONCONFORMIST MINISTERS EJECTED IN
NORFOLK IN 1662 AND IMMEDIATELY
AFTERWARDS.¹

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.²</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
1. ALBY (spelt Al- dy, and stated to be probably Aldeby in Cla- vering Hun- dred. Alby in S. Erpingham Hundred was, however, a centre of Nonconfor- mity (See No. 4), and I should incline to think that it is the place referred to).	S. Erpingham or Clavering.	BANISTER, John.
2. AYLMERTON.	N. Erpingham.	SMITH, John.
3. BARFORD.	Forehoe.	PURT, Robert. " He lost two good liv- ings of considerable value, and suffered greatly by im- prisonment and loss of goods. He continued, after his

¹ Taken from Calamy's " Nonconformists' Memorial," Vol. III, pp. 1-23, edition edited and enlarged by Samuel Palmer, and from the original work, " An Account of the Ministers."

² I have inserted the Hundreds as there are so many cases of doubtful identity.

72 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
4. BARTON HULM (or TURF).	Tunstead.	ejection, preaching at <i>Windham</i> to a good old age."
5. BACONS- THORPE (See also No. 8).	S. Erpingham.	SUMPTER, Charles. LOUGHER, John. He succeeded his father as minister of Letheringsett and later became Minister of Baconsthorpe from which he was ejected. "He could not, however, have been long in it at the time of his ejection, because he was ordained by Bp. <i>Reynolds</i> , who had but lately obtained a bishoprick (Norwich). He afterwards became minister of a Congregational church at <i>South Reppis</i> and <i>Alby</i> . He was a man of great moderation, of a catholic spirit, and a diffusive charity; much beloved and

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

respected by serious persons of all denominations. He, with many others, was imprisoned, about the time of *Monmouth's* landing, when he contracted an illness from which he never recovered. In other respects he met with no trouble ; for he had such favour among his neighbours, that his meetings were never broken up. He died *Oct. 14th, 1686.* Mr. Chr. AMYRAUT was afterwards pastor of his church." (See No. 9.) (List of his works follows.)

(BILLINGFORD,
see Stanfield.)

6. BLICKLING.
7. BLOFIELD.
8. BODHAM.

S. Erpingham.
Blofield.
Holt.

BURROUGH, Mr.
MALTBY, Samuel.
WATSON, Robert. He signed the Attestation of Ministers as Minister of BACONSTHORPE.

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
(BRADFIELD, see Nos. 41 and 47.)		
9. BUCKENHAM, NEW.	Shropham.	AMYRAUT, Christo- pher. "After his ejectment he preached in several places in this county. In his latter days he was pastor of a Con- gregational Church at <i>South Reppis</i> ." (See No. 5.) Three of his children were buried at Side- strand, 1691-92. (See p. 56.)
10. BUNWELL.	Depwade.	PITT, Nicholas (also given as PITTE- DATE).
11. BURNINGHAM (Curate) (? for BARNINGHAM in N. & S. Er- pingham. There was at that time a yeoman family of Worts, of Trunch, in N. Erpingham).		WORTS, Thomas. "Brother to <i>Mr.</i> <i>Richard Worts</i> of Foulsham. After his ejectment he was pastor of a con- gregation at GUEST- WICK. He died about 1697. He was brought from Burn- ingham to Norwich with a sort of brutal triumph, his

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

legs being chained under the horse's belly. As he was conducted to the castle, a woman looking out of a chamber - window, near St. Austin's Gate, at which he was brought in, called out in contempt and derision, ' Worts, where's now your God ? ' The good confessor in bonds, desired her to turn to *Micah*, VIII, 10. She did so, and was so struck, that she was a kind friend to him in his long confinement. The words are, ' Then she that is my enemy shall see it, and shame shall cover her which said unto me " Where is the Lord thy God." ' The same story is related of Mr. *Norman* of Bridgewater."

76 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
12. CARLTON.	It is uncertain to which of the four Carlton's in Norfolk reference is made.	GEDNY, James.
13. DENTON.	Earsham.	LAWSON, Thomas, M.A., of Cath. Coll., Cam., and Fellow of St. John's Coll., Cam. After his ejection he lived in Suffolk. "Father of the unhappy <i>Mr. Deodate Lawson</i> , who came hither from New England."
(DEREHAM, E. see No. 28.)		
14. DICKLEBOROUGH.	Diss.	CRABTREE, Elias. "Mr. Christopher Barnard of whom <i>Dr. Walker</i> gives a high character, was sequestered from this place, and appears to have been treated with great cruelty. But nothing is said of Mr. Crabtree."
15. DISS	Diss.	MORE, Richard, M.A.

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
16. DRAYTON.	Taverham.	VIN, Richard.
17. EARSHAM. (EDINGTHORPE, see No. 49.)	Earsham.	BAYES, Thomas.
18. FELTWELL.	Grimshoe.	BUTLER, John. Sub- scribed to the Attestation as Minister of OLDTON (Oulton, S. Erping- ham). After his ejectment he travelled to Smyrna, and ended his days preaching in the neighbour- hood of Harwich and Ipswich.
19. FORNCETT.	Depwade.	HINTON, William.
20. FOULSHAM and GUESTWICK.	Eynsford.	WORTS, Richard. Cruelly imprisoned in Norwich Castle and elsewhere for seven years. His sufferings are de- scribed at length. (See No. II.)
21. " GORSTON or GODNASTON." Dr. Walker states that this place should be GARVESTON.	Mitford.	(a) PURT, Robert, appointed 1654. (b) PEW, Mr. " He had a flourishing school many years at <i>Beccles</i> in Suf- folk ; and in the latter part of his

78 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		life he preached occasionally in several public churches."
22. " G R E A T - W I C H " (? for GUESTWICK,	Eynsford).	HOOKE, John.
23. HACKFORD-CUM- WHITWELL.	Eynsford.	TOWNSEND, Sampson.
24. HARDINGHAM.	Mitford.	JOSELYN, Nathaniel.
25. HEYDON.	S.Erpingham.	NEWMAN, Thomas.
26. INTWOOD.	Humbleyard.	SHEFFIELD, Mr.
27. LOPHAM.	Guiltcross.	ELLIS, Thomas. A Baptist, deprived by six justices in 1663.
28. LYNN.	Freebridge.	
(a) All Hal- lows.		HORNE, John. Of Trin. Coll., Camb., born at Long Sut- ton, Lincs., minis- ter at Bolingbroke, Lincs. and after- wards at Lynn. (See p. 53).
(b)		FENWICK, Mr.
(c)		DOMINICK, John.
29. MUNDESLEY.	N.Erpingham.	(a) AMYRAUT, Paul "In 1648 he was vicar of EAST DEREHAM . . . more of him may be known from a little piece, entitled, ' Lutheri Posthu- ma,' being prefa-

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

tory to a larger work, translated out of the Dutch ; in which it appears that Mr. *Amyraut* was an old man when he was ejected." (See p. 56.)

(b) B I D B A N K, Robert. Buried in the Chancel of Mundesley Church. Norris gives the following inscription, (now lost) " Here lieth the Body of Robert Bidbank Senior, Preacher of the Gospel in this Town, who died the 15th of April, 1661. Aetat Suae 34." Calamy is therefore wrongly informed in placing him amongst the "Bartholomew Sufferers " of 1662.

30. NAYTON (probably NECTON, which was formerly called NEIGHTON).

S. Greenhoe.

SHIPDAM, Israel.

80 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
31. NEATISHEAD.	Tunstead.	<p>(a) LEVINGTON, John.</p> <p>(b) BURKITT, Miles. Ordained originally in 1630 by the Bishop of Oxford, a strict Conformist at first, he afterwards embraced Dissenting tenets, and was removed from the living of HITCHAM, in Suffolk, at the Restoration, only to be presented shortly afterwards by Bishop Reynolds, of Norwich, to the livings of NEATISHEAD and IRSTEAD, "but he enjoyed none of the profits of them, being ejected by the Act of Uniformity, before he had been in them three months." (See p. 57).</p>
32. NORWICH.		
(a) St. Stephen's.		<p>COLLINGES, John, D.D. Of Eman. Coll., Camb. One of the commis-</p>

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

(b) St.
George's.

sioners at the Savoy Conference. Died 1690, his epitaph and List of Works is given. (See p. 52).

(1) ALLEN, Thomas, of Caius Coll., Camb. First rector of St. Edmond's but was silenced by Bishop Wren in 1636 for refusing to read the "Book of Sports." He fled to New England in 1638, remaining there until 1651, when he returned to Norwich and in 1657 became pastor of a congregational church there. He continued preaching until his death in 1673. List of works is given.

(2) WOODWARD,
Enoch.

(c) St. Giles's.

SNOWDEN, Benjamin, of Eman. Coll., Camb. "He met with good ac-

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		ceptance in his native city, which enjoyed and rejoiced in the light of his ministry, first in the public churches, till <i>Black Bartholomew</i> hid it under his dark mantle ; afterwards in private, or less public assemblies, till his total removal to a higher orb, Ap. 28, 1696, aged 70." (See p. 53.)
(d) St. Nicholas.		ENGLISH, Francis, pubd. "The Saint's Ebenezer." HASBART, John. "Mr. <i>Rastrick</i> writes to Dr. <i>Calamy</i> : I wonder nobody from <i>Norwich</i> should have sent you an account of this gentleman. I have heard that he was a very rousing awakening preacher."
33. PULHAM.	Earsham.	BENTON, Thomas, Senior.

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
34. REEPHAM.	Eynsford.	SHELDRAKE, Wm. After his ejection he became a successful dealer in wool and yarn, finally resuming his ministry as pastor to a congregation at YARMOUTH. Died about 1690.
35. REPPS, NORTH.	N.Erpingham.	CORBET, Edward. Also rector of SIDESTRAND, 1661-1662. Died in the neighbourhood soon after his ejection. Calamy says he is not to be confused with Edward Corbet, of the Westminster Assembly, but see p. 27.
36. REPPS, SOUTH.	N.Erpingham.	BROME, Edmund. He "was much esteemed for his learning, gravity, piety, and moderation, and was accounted an excellent preacher. He was so devoted to his studies, that he

84 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		left the management of all his temporal concerns to his wife. After he was ejected, he exercised his ministry in private, as he had opportunity, among his old parishioners, till the time of his death, which was about 1667." (See also Numbers 5 and 9.)
37. ROLLESBY.	E. and W. Flegg.	REYNER, John. A man of but little education. After his ejectment he went into business at Rotterdam, dying there in 1697.
38. ROUGHTON.	N.Erpingham.	REYNOLDS, John. After his ejectment he retired to London, dying there in 1692.
39. ST. FAITH'S.	Taverham.	WINDRESS, Mr. (Given in the text under Norwich.)
40. SCOTTOW.	S.Erpingham.	BIDBANCK, William, M.A. Retired to Denton, where he ministered to a

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		congregation until his death in 1693. Author of "A Present for Children."
(SIDESTRAND, see No. 35.)		
41. STALHAM.	Happing.	LUCAS, John. He lived afterwards at NORWICH, often preaching at TUNSTEAD, BRADFIELD, and other places.
42. STANFIELD and BILLINGFORD.	Launditch. Eynsford.	ALEXANDER, Samuel. Appointed 1654.
43. STIBBARD.	Gallow.	DURRANT, John.
44. STRATTON, St. Michael.	Depwade.	BENTON, Thomas, Junior.
45. SWANTON MORLEY.	Launditch.	DALIEL, John.
46. TRUNCH.	N.Erpingham.	LAWRENCE, Richard, M.A., of St. John's Coll., Camb., later of Oxford. (See p. 57.)
47. TUNSTEAD.	Tunstead.	GREEN, John. Appointed in 1657, he ministered to the people of the district for "above fifty years," sometimes in disguise. He "was moder-

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

ately congregational in his judgment . . . When the necessities of a neighbouring congregation at BRADFELD called for his help, he preached to them in 1667, as well as at his own place, every Lord's Day, as long as his health and strength would permit. He was of a very pleasant aspect, and cheerful conversation : an excellent and lively preacher. He had an amicable correspondence with many who differed from him in opinion ; particularly with the very worthy Mr. *Jeffery*, minister of *North Walsham*, where he spent some of his last years. His acquaintance with whom was so intimate and pleasing,

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
48. WALCOT.	Happing.	<p>that he desired to be buried in his church, as near as conveniently could be, to the place where he himself designed to be laid ; which accordingly he was." He died in 1709.</p> <p>CORY, John. " An humble serious Person, but of weak lungs, and a low voice, on which account he rarely preached, unless upon extraordinary occasions. But being excellently well skilled in the Latin and Greek languages, he taught a private school at NORWICH for many years before his death " in 1698.</p>
49. WALSHAM, NORTH.	Tunstead.	<p>MITCHELL, Nathaniel. Subscribed to the Attestation as minister of EDINGTHORPE. He</p>

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		married a sister of Dr. Collinges, of Norwich, q.v., and suffered constantly from melancholia. (A certain Mr. BREVITER or BREUITER was also at one time minister of NORTH WALSHAM, and as such solemnised marriages occasionally in the parish of SIDESTRAND 1651-3. He subscribed to the Attestation as minister of EDINGTHORPE; possibly he was an assistant to the voiceless Mr. CORY !)
50. WALSINGHAM.	N. Greenhoe.	NORTHCROSS, Nathaniel.
51. WYMONDHAM.	Forehoe.	MONY, John. (Possibly a son of the Rev. John Mony, rector of Sidestrand 1598-1600. The name of Mony occurs frequently in the Sidestrand Registers.) " He

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
52. YARMOUTH.	E. Flegg.	<p>was eminent both for learning and piety, and generally admired for his frequent, fervent and exact preaching ; and the rather, because he never wrote any part of his sermons."</p> <p>(a) BRINSLEY, John, M.A., of Eman. Coll., Camb. " His carriage was highly civil, tho' grave. His discourse was facetious, especially in suitable company ; but in the pulpit none had a more reverend aspect, or discovered a greater degree of seriousness." (See p. 54, for a full account of him.) List of works is given.</p> <p>(b) ALLEN, John, " teacher of the large church of which Mr. BRINSLEY was pastor." Retired to Gorles-</p>

*Parish.**Hundred.**Minister.*

ton, and died of plague at YARMOUTH in 1665.

(c) BRIDGE, William, M.A., Fellow of Eman. Coll., Camb. Incumbent of St. George, Tombland, NORWICH, until silenced by Bishop Wren in 1637, and was afterwards excommunicated and retired to Holland. He returned to England in 1642 and settled at YARMOUTH as an Independent Minister. He died in 1670. (See p. 55.) List of works is given and an excellent portrait.

(d) TOOKIE, Job, of Eman. Coll., Camb. Son of the Rev. Job Tookie of St. Ives, Hunts (who was ejected for refusal to read the "Book of Sports.") He was previously chaplain to Lady

<i>Parish.</i>	<i>Hundred.</i>	<i>Minister.</i>
		Westmoreland, and tutor to her sons Lord Townshend and Sir Horatio Townshend, minis- ter of St. Martin's Vintry, London, " where he made no long stay, being dissatisfied with their general way of administering the sacrament," preacher at St. Alban's Abbey where " the wide- ness of the place drowned his voice." Retired to London after his ejection from YARMOUTH. (For further par- ticulars, see p. 55.)

THE FOLLOWING NINE MINISTERS " AFTER-
WARDS CONFORMED."

DUNHAM, GREAT.	Launditch.	BENTON, John.
SHIPDAM.	Mitford.	LEWIS, Mark.
WALCOT and E.	Happing.	ELWOOD, Mr.
RUSTON.		
HINGHAM.	Forehoe.	DAY, Mr.

CAWSTON.

S.Erpingham. DENHAM, Mr.

SCARNING.

Launditch. GOOCH, Mr. and
NEWTON, John.

" ROMORTON "

(possibly REY-

MERSTON

Mittford). POOL, Mr.

BLICKLING.

S.Erpingham. ODER, Mr.

THE SAD HISTORY OF MARGERY DE LA BÉCHE

THE Patent Roll Calendars are very beguiling reading, for practically every page contains something of interest to the topographer, the historian or the antiquary.

One day when I was looking up certain Norfolk references in the Calendars for the reigns of Edward II and Edward III, my eye caught a lengthy, detailed and altogether delightful inventory of the property of a lady lately deceased. Her name was Margery de la Béche, and I felt impelled to try and discover who she was and what had been her history. I had not proceeded very far in my researches before I learned that the poor lady had been the victim of a brutal tragedy, which illustrated cruelly and clearly enough the risks and dangers which had to be encountered by an unmarried or widowed lady of wealth in the fourteenth century. The position of an unprotected woman in those days was more than unenviable—it was untenable.

From one source and another I pieced together the sad story of Margery de la Béche. She was born a Poynings, of that knightly and noble family

which held estates in Sussex (whence the name of Poynings), and in Norfolk, where their connexion with the county is still perpetuated by Poinings Manor in Hockwold and the Manor of Sydistron-Poynings in Sidestrand.

Towards the beginning of Edward III's reign, we find Margery de Poynings married (as his second wife) to Edmund Bacon, of Gresham and Aylmerton in Norfolk, of Hatfield Peverel and Cressinghall in Essex and of Ewelme in Oxfordshire. His Hatfield Peverel estate had been granted to him by Edward II in 1310.¹ He had by his first wife, Joan Brewes, a daughter, Margaret, who married William, Baron Kerdeston; and by his second wife, Margery Poynings, another daughter, Margery, who became the wife of Sir William Molyns.² Dying in 1338, Edmund Bacon left his two daughters co-heiresses, while his widow held "in right of her late husband" the Essex property, together with two Knights' Fees in Gresham and Aylmerton, which in a subsequent return of Knights' Fees, in 20 Edward III (1346), on the occasion of the knighting of the King's eldest son, were valued at £4.³

By that time, not only had her first husband died, but it is probable that she had been widowed for the second time. Her second husband was Sir

¹ "Pat. Roll," Edw. II, m. 8. I.

² Blomefield's "Norfolk," Vol. VIII, p. 127. Blomefield, however, is wrong in stating that both daughters were the children of Margery, his second wife.

³ Rye, "North Erpingham," p. 240.

Nicholas de la Béche. He came of an ancient Berkshire family, which took its name from the manor of "La Béche" in the parish of Aldworth. Philip de la Béche, sheriff of Berkshire in 1331, had a grant in 1336 of the right of free warren over the manor of Beaumes or Beaumys in the parishes of Shinfield and Swallowfield, which in those days formed part of a detached and outlying portion of Wiltshire. On his death, a couple of years later, his estates were granted by the king to his brother, Sir Nicholas de la Béche, who was already a very large landholder in Berkshire and other counties, his estates including the "manors of Harwell and Leckhamstead *com* Berks and Watlington *com* Oxon, the last-named being a fortified castle."¹ In 1338 he obtained licence to rebuild and "fortify his manor house at Beaumys,"² which thus became known as the Castle of Beaumes.

Sir Nicholas had held various important appointments, notably that of "tutor or superintendent to the Black Prince, and in 1335-6 . . . Constable of the Tower, where the Royal Children were to be left under his care during the King's absence in France."³ Apparently he was grossly neglectful of his charges, who were given over to the care of

¹ See Lyson's "Magna Britannia," 1806 edit. (Berkshire section.)

² *Ibid.*

³ See "Swallowfield and its owners," by Lady Russell, in quarterly pt. of Berks Archæological and Architectural Society's publications, Oct., 1890, pp. 151-4.

three ordinary servants, and on the king's return de la Béche was imprisoned. Less than two years later, however, he was pardoned and "reinstated as Constable of the Tower, and it was then too that he was permitted to build and fortify the Castle of Beaumys."

He had married Margery Bacon in 1339, but their married life was of short duration, for Sir Nicholas died in or before 1346, leaving Margery de la Béche a widow for the second time in eight years.

She appears to have settled down at the manor of Beaumes, with a relative of her own, Michael de Poynings, "le uncle" or "the elder" as he was called, as her guardian and protector. In less than a year, however, we find her married for the third time to a certain Gerard del Isle. Of their brief married life together we know nothing; all we know is that it was very soon interrupted by the terrible events of March, 1347. Gerard del Isle apparently played no part in the tragedy itself; he was, however, appointed by the king to try and arrest the malefactors concerned in it. The Patent Rolls tell the tale very fully.

1347. *March 31st. Reading.*

"Inasmuch as a scandalous outcry prevails everywhere among the people and very grievous complaint has been made to the King that John

de Dalton 'chivaler,'¹ Thomas de Arden, 'chivaler,' Matthew de Haydsk, 'chivaler,' William, son of John Trussel, 'chivaler,'² Edmund de Mamcestre,³ 'chivaler,' and others by force ravished Margery de la Béche, united in lawful matrimony to Gerard del Isle, on the holy day of Good Friday, before the dawn, at her manor at Beaumes by Redyng, where the king's son, Lionei, keeper of England, was then staying, within the verge of the Marshalsea of the household of the said keeper, and abducted her against her will whither they would, without reverence for God, Holy Church or the King, and to the terror of the said keeper and the rest of the King's children then with him there and all in those parts, and are now running to and fro that they may not be brought to justice for the felony; the king has appointed the said Gerard to arrest the said persons and all others who shall be indicted of the felony wherever found and bring them before the Council, and because Gerard fears bodily harm in the execution of the appointment from the said evil-doers, who are plotting to do him all the evil which they can, he has granted special licence for him and all those of his Company to go armed for their self-defence. Further, he has taken him and all his men in to his special protection and safe conduct while executing the premises."⁴

¹ Son of a Lancashire landholder.

² "Of Cublesdon," Pat. Roll, 21 Edw. III, pt. II, m. 25^d.

³ Also spelt Mauncestre.

⁴ "Pat. Roll," 21 Edw. III, pt. I, m. 21^d.

In the Close Roll, dated the same day, an order, upon pain of forfeiture, is made to John de Dalton, knight, "to have Margery de la Béche, without injury to her person, before Lionel, keeper of England, and the King's council, at Westminster, with all possible speed, so that she be there on Wednesday after the quinzaine of Easter at latest, to do and receive what shall there be determined."¹

On April 20th a commission of oyer and terminer is directed to William de Thorpe and others in the County of Wiltshire, "touching the persons who in the absence of the king beyond seas for the defence of his realm and rights . . . by night seditiously assaulted and broke the manor of Beaumes by Redyng and ravished Margery late the wife of Nicholas de la Béche, killed Michael de Ponynges 'le uncle,'"² while Thomas le Clerk of Shipton and others carried away goods and perpetrated other felonies. A further complaint states that "Robert le Hunte, chaplain of the said Margery then lying sick there, for fear of the assault and evil deed presently died and they that assaulted her then there, mutilated some so that their life was despaired of."³ In addition to the personal injuries, damage to the value of £1,000 is claimed.

On May 10th, the criminals, having "betaken themselves to the march of Scotland," Henry de

¹ "Close Roll," 21 Edw. III, pt. I, m. 21^d.

² "Pat. Roll," *ibid.*, m. 19^d. c.m. 7^d.

³ *Ibid.*, pt. II, m. 21.

Percy and Ralph de Nevill are appointed "to take the said evil-doers with their adherents and the said Margery," and at the same time a mandate is sent to "Edward, King of Scots, in no wise to admit John de Dalton and his accomplices . . . into Scotland, but to arrest them anywhere within his lordship or power, or in the king's land or lordship in that land, or in the marches aforesaid, and have them brought in safe custody to the Tower."¹

On June 25th a further commission orders the arrest of the ringleaders "wherever found in the County of Lancaster,"² and in addition to the malefactors already named, the following are also cited as aiders and abettors in the crime—Thomas de Charnels, 'chivaler,' Thomas de Dutton, Robert de Dalton, 'le cosyn,' William Whytacre of the County of Warwick, Henry Mawaryn, John Brown, Gilbert de Haydok, Robert de Dalton, father of John de Dalton, Sarah Baillop, mother of Robert de Dalton, 'le cosyn,' Adam Longbok, 'taillour,' of Loundres, William Haydok, William de Whitten and John de Notebermn. These all having been outlawed by William de Thorpe and his fellow justices in Wiltshire, are now supposed to be in hiding in the County of Lancaster, and the commissioners are exhorted to lay hands on them and

¹ *Ibid.*, 21 Edw. III, pt. I, m. 5^d. A similar mandate is sent to the keeper of the town of Berwick.

² It will be remembered that de Dalton was a Lancashire man.

'bring them to the Tower of London for delivery in to the custody of the Constable of the said Tower.'"¹ Later on in the year several other persons were also accused of being parties to the crime, notably Thomas de Litterlond, prior of Burscough (Co. Lancaster), who appears to have been acquitted, and two other priests. In most cases the accused were outlawed.

These various appointments to attach the bodies of the criminals appear to have been uniformly fruitless, and we do not read of the apprehension of any of them. Some, indeed, forfeited their lands to the crown, as, for example, the leaders, Sir John de Dalton and Sir Thomas Ardern, but most of them were subsequently granted full pardons. Perhaps the most astonishing thing in the whole grim story is to find that Margery de la Béche had become the wife of her abductor, Sir John de Dalton. We learn this fact from two entries in the Patent Rolls and Close Rolls for October, 1348. The first states "whereas Nicholas de Bokelond, king's clerk, and William de Berkhamptede by the king's order and by commission under his seal called the 'griffoun,' sold to divers merchants all the great wood in the parks, out-woods, hays, orchards and elsewhere in the manors and lands late of Margery, late the wife of Nicholas de la Béche, *now wife of John de Dalton, knight*, in his hands on account of the forfeiture of the said John, now outlawed for

¹ *Ibid.*, 21 Edw. III, pt. II, m. 25^d.

felonies and seditions in the County of Wilts. . . . ; on their petition the king grants that they, their heirs or executors shall not at any future time be impeached or disturbed by reason of such sale.”¹

The second reference is in connexion with the sale of certain of Margery de la Béche’s lands and goods to her kinsman, Michael de Poynings, “the younger,” son of Sir Thomas de Poynings.

On August 26th, 1347, a commission was directed “to John de Codyngton, king’s clerk, to appraise on the oaths of knights and good-men of the Counties of Berks, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk and Sussex, the horses, oxen, cows, sheep and all other animals whatsoever, late of Margery late the wife of Nicholas de la Béche in her lands in those counties, *which the king has committed to Michael de Ponynge*s, and of all the corn whether growing in those lands or gathered into barns there, and to certify the king thereof in the chancery.”² On October 25th of the following year the receipt for the purchase of Margery de la Béche’s goods is enrolled: “Whereas the king, by letters patent under the great seal lately sold to Michael, son of Thomas de Ponynge, knight, all goods, late of Margery, late the wife of Nicholas de la Béche, for a sum paid to the receiver of his chamber, as by the letters of acquittance made to Michael more fully appears; at the petition of the latter made with instance, the king for his

¹ *Ibid.*, 22 Edw. III, pt. III, m. 19.

² *Ibid.*, 21 Edw. III, pt. III, m. 37^d.

security avouches, as well the sale as the purchase and possession of the said goods, and acknowledges that he has received in full at the receipt of the chamber the sum agreed on, whereof he by these presents acquits the said Michael and his executors against himself and all other persons."¹

By a later account it appears that Michael de Ponynges had the property on lease at a yearly rental of 500 marks, and that his tenancy terminated with the death of his kinswoman. This event took place on September 30th, 1349,² a little more than two years after the terrible abduction from Beaumes. Poor lady, she must have been glad to escape from this troublesome world. She was buried by her second husband, Sir Nicholas de la Béche (whose name she seems to have kept in spite of her two subsequent marriages) in Aldworth Church, Berkshire, "where their effigies are much admired."

From 1348 onwards the Patent Rolls contain sundry pardons granted to persons concerned in the abduction of Margery de la Béche and the death of Michael de Ponynges, "le uncle." Most of the culprits obtained remission of their sentences, even Sir Thomas Ardern, who, it will be remembered, had forfeited his lands to the crown.³ Many of the pardons were evidently due to the intervention of the powerful Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, at whose

¹ *Ibid.*, 22 Edw. III, pt. III, m. 31.

² *Ibid.*, 24 Edw. III, pt. I, m. 40.

³ John de Morley is forgiven all his crimes "except the king's suit for the death of Michael de Ponynges, the elder."

instance most of them were granted. It is little short of astounding, though, to find Michael de Ponynges, "the younger," of all people, assisting some others of the accused to escape their sentences !

In the eyes of the law the death of Margery appears to have ended the whole bad business, and on May 4th, 1350, Sir John de Dalton, her abductor and fourth husband, received the royal pardon, "for good service and because he has humbly submitted himself to the king's grace, of the king's suit for the ravishment of Margery, late the wife of Nicholas de la Béche and other felonies and trespasses in the manor of Beaumes by Redyng."¹

Here the story would end but for the fact that Michael de Ponynges, the younger, had a dispute as to the administration of her property with Edmund de la Béche, the then holder of Beaumes. This Edmund was "keeper of the wardrobe," and later on, in 1369, archdeacon of Berkshire.² To him Michael de Ponynges had to hand over all the goods and chattels of the unfortunate Margery. Thus we are brought back to the beginning again, to the inventory which first led me to discover the sad history which I have related. It is the list of her personal possessions handed over in September, 1351, to Edmund de la Béche. The curious can read it in full in the Patent Rolls. Here I merely

¹ "Pat. Roll," 24 Edw. III, pt. I, m. 15.

² See "Swallowfield and its Owners."

give the more interesting portions of this catalogue of the contents of a fourteenth century lady's house.

Vestments.

The inventory begins with a list of vestments—five complete sets in all—consisting of chasuble, albe, amice, stole, maniple (*fanoun*) and girdle, and in addition two of them have tunics and dalmatics for the deacons. The materials are magnificent, "cloth of gold striped with silk and yellow," or "green camlet" (*camarca*¹), powdered with griffons and lined with yellow *carde*,² another is of cloth of gold lined with green, powdered with stags, *mentailles* and peacocks, others of murrey³ velvet and cloth of gold powdered with griffons and both embroidered with the arms of de la Béche. Copes are also described—two of pale cloth of gold lined with blue, and a third to match the green camlet vestments. The "arms of Bacoun" are embroidered on the apparel for one of the amices. Next come four Corporals,⁴ the first is of gold embroidery with a Crucifix and St. Mary and St. John on the

¹ "*Camica*, camlet, a fine stuff of camel's hair."—Bailey.

² *Carde*, probably a carded woollen material.

³ "Murrey, mulberry colour"—Bailey.

⁴ "*Corperail*. The corporall, the fine linen wherein the Sacrament is put."—Cotgrave. "After the passioun of Ali-saundre the pope, Sixtus was pope almost elevene yere: he ordeyned that trisagium, that is, 'Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,' shulde be songe at masse, and that the Corperas shulde nought be of silk nother sendal, but clene lynnyn cloth nought i-dyed."—Trevisa's Higden V. 11, quoted "Catholicon Anglicum," f.n., p. 76.

one side, and the Assumption on the other ; the others are of red check, and there are riddels of the same material belonging to two of them.

Chapel Furniture.

One lantern for the Chapel.

One box.

Five surplices, of which three are new and two are feeble.

Two " plumers " for the Chapel lined with red sendal.¹

One ivory image of Our Lady.

One super-altar.

Three gold cloths, of which two belong to a set.

One missal covered with black.

One gradual² covered with sealskin.

One ancient porthors.³ Another covered with red.

One old antiphoner.⁴

One troper.⁵

One Chalice.

¹ " *Sendal*, a sort of thin Cyprus silk."—Bailey.

² The *gradual* or *grayle* provided the music for the Mass. Fully described by Wordsworth and Littlehales, in " *The Old Service Books of the English Church*," p. 203, etc.

³ Portus' *portiferium*, " a breviary or book containing the services of the Canonical Hours of the Church, sometimes accompanied with musical notes. The word is under numerous forms, such as Portesse, Portous, Porthors, etc." " *Catholicon Anglicum*," f.n., p. 287.

⁴ The *Antiphoner* provided the music for the Canonical Hours.—" *The Old Service Books*," p. 104, etc.

⁵ *Troper*, *troperium*, *troparium*, " a book of *tropi* or musical jubila." *Ibid.*, p. 206, etc.

One primer covered with black sewn with red.

One psalter covered with linen cloth.

One great seyn¹ for the Chapel.

One matrace.²

One *sonal* (? bell) and two *fiols* (?) of silver.

Frontals and Hangings.

The Altar Frontals and Coverings are described in detail. One frontal of murry velvet powdered with the arms of de la Béche ; one larger frontal of purple velvet, $3\frac{3}{4}$ yards at the least, powdered with divers images and embroidered with the arms of de la Béche ; one old frontal of "towail" (linen), with a frontal powdered with divers arms, at the one end the arms of Ponynge, at the other those of Bacoun ; one "towail" with a frontal of the same set ; another "towail" without frontal ; one cloth for the Altar lined with "canevaz" (?) with a frontal and a cloth for the lectern of the same set.

Materials.

Besides the materials belonging to the Chapel, other stuffs are described as follow :

¹ "Catholicon Anglicum," p. 328, gives "a seyn" as *sagena*, a net. It is difficult to see what its meaning is in this context.

² Here again I am in doubt as to the exact meaning of the word. The same authority gives "mattress, *matricia*, a flock bed or linen covering," f.n., p. 231. Bailey has a word "matrass, a long straight-neck'd vessel of glass."

One piece of murry velvet embroidered with gold vine leaves ; $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth "vert de soie, reiez dort vert vermaill et blaunk" ; one "accon" of purple velvet, embroidered with the head of a gold leopard ; $6\frac{1}{2}$ yards of Indian silk (*soie dynde*) ; 6 yards of black velvet ; $2\frac{3}{4}$ yards of black samite ; 7 yards of "sandal d'oré" ; $8\frac{1}{2}$ yards of "sandal vert fieble," and $8\frac{1}{2}$ of the same in a better quality.

Numerous curtains and carpets for rooms and beds follow next, of "woven silk," of "green samite," of "red cloth furred with minever," of "cloth dacolyn" (of Cologne), of "tawny worsted," of "white powdered with ermine," of "double worsted *besauntees*," of "green sendal," of "green, red and yellow check." Coverlets of the same materials are often included, as well as "a coverlet from India checked in yellow" (*dynde chekere de jaune*), four yellow and two red coverlets "covered with conies" (*conils*) and four carpets of "white bokeram, powdered with boterflyes." Door curtains are next described, two being of "vermilion check." Then there are sets of benches (*bankers*), "powdered with roses and paper-jayes and bordered with the arms of de la Béche." Cushions for the back, and testers "of worsted powdered with figures of knights and ladies," and dossals for the hall "striped with black," and "of Parys work with images" (*del œuvre de Parys de œuvres des ymages*) conclude the list of the ornamental household stuff.

Beds, etc.

Details of beds and mattresses follow, one of the latter being described as "dynde carde et de vert." There are besides "two great feathers for beds."

Two mantles of "murry Dirland" and six pairs of coffers for travelling are amongst the items which follow.

Pots and Pans.

It would take too much space to give an account of all the useful household utensils. The list includes : three iron forks for the hall, two pairs of knives with black handles, three knives for trenchers, two mortars of iron with pestles of iron, eight iron skewers, three gridirons, one iron called "weg," one basket of pewter ladels, five basons, round and otherwise, four little basons for the room, costres or costrells¹ for sauce, and irons for the hall and the kitchen and two cases for wax.

Linen.

The linen is next described in detail : "One wide and long piece for double towels of Parys work," twenty-two napkins "of divers works," "short

¹ *Costrell*, a vessel to carry wine in. Wyclif also uses the word in "Ruth," II, 9 : "If also thou thrustist, go to the litil costrils, and drynk watris" (authorized version, "go unto the vessels"). See "Catholicon Anglicum," f.n., p. 78.

towels," "double towels," "bread cloths," "spice cloths," sheets, and so on.

Cups.

The buttery and pantry were also well-appointed and contained one or two real treasures, as, for example, "a great maser,¹ newly enamelled in the bowl with the arms of de la Béche," and two smaller ones "enamelled in the bowl with the arms of Porynges and de la Béche." Another has the arms of de la Béche alone, and there are also two old masers. Besides, there is "one horn of black bugle, mounted and ornamented in silver," six wooden pitchers, eight leather pitchers for the buttery, and last, but not least, "a great iron pot called 'Brown Robin'!"

Books.

The best part of the inventory comes last, for it consists of a list of Margery de la Béche's books. It seems a pity to attempt to translate their enthralling titles, so I print them just as they are in the original:

"Un livre de romance covert de noir ove rouge tissues.

Item j livre de romance que commence 'Que Dieu ad done science.'

¹ "Maser, a broad standing cup or drinking bowl."—Bailey.

Item j romance que commence 'Après ce qu'
Alisaundre.'

Item j romance que commence 'Innocens
Lapostoill.'

Item j autre que commence 'Seigneurs soiez en
pees.'

Item j autre que commence 'Amour si est bel
commencement.'

Item j livre d'art dechesse (of the art of chess).

Item j livre que commence 'A son travaillant
seigneur.'

Item j autre que commence 'Si poet homme
saver comment.'

Item j autre livre que commence 'De Rome
tient Urban la mestrie.'

Item j autre que commence 'Les aunciennes
estoires dient.'

Item j primer covert de purpre velvet."

Such were the possessions of the unfortunate Lady Margery de la Béche, and looking back from the twentieth century one is struck more than ever at the gulf which separates us from the fourteenth century. How brutal her story sounds to our modern ears; strange to us too are the titles of her books, and the names of her pots and pans, "Brown Robin," "weg" and the rest. We are so ignorant of the manner of her life that we can only hope that perhaps it was not so utterly tragical as the Patent Roll story seems to make it. And

what of the Lady Margery de la Béche herself? How can we regard her—as victim or adventuress, as heroine or siren? We are conscious that of the past we know but little, and, like the writer of one of her own books, we can only say, “*Si poet homme saver comment !*”

DID PRE-REFORMATION PRIESTS EVER MARRY ?

At the present day the question of the celibacy of the clergy is once more under discussion. There are Anglicans who affirm that the English Church, in sanctioning at the Reformation a married priesthood, departed gravely from Catholic usage and tradition, and that its action amounted to a rejection of what had hitherto been in the West a universal law of clerical celibacy. Others, again, with equal tenacity hold the theory that the Primitive Church accepted clerical marriage, and that several of the Councils of the Church permitted such marriages, provided only that no priest should re-marry after the death of his wife.¹ I hold no

¹ An interesting letter on this subject appeared under the signature of "Widower Priest" in the "Church Times" on November 11th, 1921, the greater part of which I venture to insert here as a note :

St. Paul, the "Apostle of the Gentiles," directs Titus, upon whom he had conferred the apostolic office, that in ordaining "bishops," i.e., priests, or "elders," these should be individually "the husband of one wife, having faithful children," etc. (Titus i, 5, 6.)

That was the rule in the first stage.

The Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314) decrees that those who at the time of ordination as deacons declared their intention to

brief for either party, but merely offer to both of them the following notes on married clergy in Norfolk, asking them to weigh the evidence laid before them, and come to their own conclusions.

First a word as to the reason why this short collection of extracts was made.

In 1918 I published a book entitled "The History of an East Anglian Soke," and in it I commented upon the fact that married clergy were not unknown in Norfolk in the middle and earlier ages. His Eminence Cardinal Gasquet, who was kind enough

marry should be allowed to marry, and to remain in the ministry. That is the rule in the Eastern Churches at the present day.

What are known as the "Canons of the Apostles" order that "a bishop, presbyter or deacon shall not put away his wife under pretext of religion. If he does, he shall be separated from Communion; and if he persevere, he shall be deposed." (Canon v, xii.)

The Canons of the Council of Gangra, which were received throughout the East and West (A.D. 324), anathematizes "those who separate themselves from a married priest, as though it were not right to communicate in the Oblation, when such an one ministers."

It was proposed at the Council of Nice (A.D. 325) that the clergy should be obliged to abstain from the society of their wives, whom they had married before their ordination. This was rejected by the earnest appeal of an Egyptian prelate, himself unmarried.

These references should surely be sufficient to show that the Church of England's rule is in full accord with Catholic traditions.

There is one other canon forbidding a priest to marry a second time, if and when he has lost his wife by death. Recently it was stated that—in Serbia, I think—certain of the bishops were appealed to on behalf of some of their priests, whose wives had been murdered, to allow a second marriage, but this was sternly refused on the expressed ground that the Church did not allow a priest to marry more than once. . . .

to read and otherwise approve the book, took exception to this particular point of history and asked me if I could furnish him with any direct evidence or give the details of authentic cases of clerical marriage.¹ Turning to the books ² which I had at hand I collected the following information, which I give for clearness' sake in note form.

*"Norfolk Archæology," Vol. IX., pp. 187 to 200,
"On married clergy in Norfolk in the Thirteenth
Century," by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D.*

Dr. Jessopp traces briefly the history of a celibate priesthood from the earliest times. He cites Dunstan's campaign against the married clergy—"how firmly these were settled in their occupation, how completely they were recognised as respectable members of Society, may appear from the fact that, strongly as Dunstan wished to back the monks and bring about a different state of things, he never was able to get rid of the Canons from his own Cathedral at Canterbury and there they stayed during all his

¹ The extract from my book is as follows: "Church law had forbidden the marriage of the clergy, but in Norfolk, at any rate, it had failed to stop the practice, where in fact clerical marriages were winked at by the authorities. At Ranworth we get a case of the son succeeding his father as rector quite as a matter of course."—"History of an East Anglian Soke," p. 440.

² The books consulted were "Domesday Book," "Norfolk Archæology," Blomefield's "Norfolk," and the "Victoria History of Norfolk."

long primacy." (See "Dunstan and his Policy," in the late Mr. E. W. Robertson's "Historical Essays.")

(p. 193.)

"The decree of the Lateran Council of 1059, which forbade any ecclesiastic living in wedlock from celebrating mass or discharging any sacred office, became the law of all Churches in Communion with the See of Rome, and has continued to be accepted as law from that day to the present. It is quite certain, however, that this law took a long time before it could be generally enforced."

He states that in East Anglia the secular clergy at this period were in a numerical majority over the regulars, and that they resisted the decree. Archbishop Anselm encountered active opposition in his efforts to enforce celibacy.

(p. 195.)

"The Decrees of the Synod of London, A.D. 1108, given in Florence of Worcester, *sub anno*, imply that the marriage of the clergy was at least common. It is not a little curious to note that Thomas, Archbishop of York, under whose name, in conjunction with that of Anselm, the decrees of the Synod were promulgated, was himself the son of a priest." See Malmesbury, "Gesta Pontificum" (Rolls Series), Par. 42, p. 66; Eadmer, "Hist. Norv.," lib. I, p. 7 (Selden).

(p. 195.)

He surmises that Bishop Herbert de Losinga was

married, and he instances the following married Bishops :

(1) Aelmar (brother of Archbp. Stigand), Bishop of Elmham, 1047. (See Stubbs, "Regist. Sac. Brit." Malmesbury, "Gesta Pontif.," p. 150.)

(2) Herfast, Bishop of Thetford, 1070.

(3) William de Beaufeu, Bishop of Norwich, 1086. In "Domesday Book," Vol. II, p. 194*b*, it is expressly said "that Aelmar obtained the manor of Blofield with his wife, whom he married after he was bishop (*sic*¹), and that (in default of issue, I suppose) the manor came to his successor in the bishopric as heir to the bishop's see.

The same record ("Domesday Book," Vol. II, 118*b*) informs us that Bishop Arfast, Aelmar's successor, had two or more sons, who managed to get possession of the church of St. Mary at Thetford, and that they were actually in possession when the Commissioners made their survey.

The marriage of William de Beaufeu is not established with such absolute certainty, nor is there sufficient proof of that which Blomefield asserts unhesitatingly, viz., that Richard de Bellafago, Archdeacon of Norwich in 1107, was the bishop's son ; but I think few who turn to Mr. Rye's . . . first volume of . . . "Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany" will doubt that William de Beaufeu was a married man, and left offspring behind him.

It is not conceivable that, with this remarkable

¹ See p. 120.

series of precedents in the persons of their bishops, the East Anglian clergy should have failed to follow the example set. . . .

(p. 196.)

“ Thus, on the 9th November, 1194, a remarkable cause was tried at Westminster, the particulars of which are to be found in Sir F. Palgrave’s ‘ Introduction to the Rolls and Records of the King’s Justicians from the 6th Richard I to the Accession of King John,’ in which it appears that the parsons of Dunston, near Norwich, had always held the benefice from father to son until the death of the last parson without apparently male issue.

“ In the same volume we find, p. 401, among the Pleas of 20th June, 1199, one which complains of the disseising of a certain Roger, a cleric, and Nicholas, his son, in respect of a tenement at some place in Suffolk ; and five years before a case is reported between Robert de Selton or Shelton on the one part, and Robert, son of the priest of Shelton, on the other, in a question of homage. So again among the Chancery Rolls of the 3rd John we meet with the names of Absolom son of the priest, William son of the priest, Robert son of a cleric, and all these in East Anglia.

“ But the fact is, instances of the mention of the sons of clergy in the records of the twelfth century occur plentifully enough, and the fact of the marriage of the clergy during this period hardly requires

proving. It is when we get down to the thirteenth century that married parsons are not to be met with so frequently. . . . Nevertheless, there is no doubt that there were married clergy in Norfolk down to the reign of Edward I at least. . . . Among the small collection of early charters relating to Keswick, printed by Mr. Hudson Gurney in 1841, there are no less than three which make mention of a certain clergyman named Henry de Norwich and his wife, Katherine, who together buy land in Keswick ; while amongst the witnesses to another of the deeds occurs the signature of *Walter filius Presbyteri*, so that at least two clergymen were married within a mile of Keswick towards the close of the thirteenth century. It is, however, among the remarkable muniments in the possession of Mr. North at Rougham that the most curious evidence of the existence of clerical marriages in Norfolk during the thirteenth century is to be found, and that evidence is probably unique. Not only does it appear that by far the greatest landowner in Rougham during the first half of the reign of Edward I was a certain Thomas of Rougham, whose grandsire had been a parson, possibly the parson of the parish, and who is repeatedly named,¹ but one of those thirteenth century charters is actually a grant in which Herbert Buzun of Wissing-

¹ " Among the witnesses to the charters of this period, too, I find frequently the names of Galfridus, described as *clericus*, and of *his two sons* William and Alan. All three appear as persons of some consideration in the village community."

sett bestows his lay fee in Yelverton, together with 20s. annual rent and his daughter Emma's hand, upon William the son of Josceline the priest of Yelverton. The remarkable part about this transaction being that the Buzuns were at this time not only the chief people in the parish, but actually the patrons of the advowson, and it is more than probable that they had given the benefice to Josceline the father, as they bestowed their daughter upon William the son."

[Two of the above mentioned documents are printed in full—viz., one dealing with "Henrico de Norwico clerico et Katerine uxori sue," in which this sentence occurs: "Henrico et Katerine et eorum heredibus ex eis conjunctum et legitime provenientibus" . . . And the Rougham Charter—"Notum sit tam presentibus quam futuris. Quod ego Herbertuo Bozun de Wichigsete concessi et dedi et hoc presenti carta mea confirmavi *Willo filio Gocelini sacerdotis de Gelrvertune totum Laicum feodum Cum Emma filia mea quod predictus Gocelinus tenuit in Gelvertunia silicet in pratis in nemoribus, et in marisco,*" etc. "Rougham Muniments," No. 19.]

*From "Domesday Book."*¹

"*Lands of the Bishop of Thetford,*" folio 195, under Blofield :

¹ Transcribed from the translation of the Norfolk portion of "Domesday Book" in the "Victoria History of Norfolk," Vol. II.

"This manor Aylmer got (*accepit*) with his wife before he was bishop, and afterwards held it in his bishopric. Now Bishop William holds it."

"*The King's Lands*," folio 118b.

"In Tetford (Thetford) is the church of St. Mary, which Stigand the Archbishop held. Now the sons of Arfast the bishop (holds it)."

Blomefield's "History of Norfolk," Vol. X, pp. 43-44
SCARNING.

Quoting "an inquisition taken in the reign of Henry II, by Sir Roger Freville, Martin de Helegate, Roger, son of Simon, etc.; it was found that Robert de Skerning, who was formerly rector of this church, and lord of a fee, gave the tithes of his fee to the Church of Norwich in the time of St. Thomas Becket, the Martyr, without any diminution.

"Afterwards, Richard, son of the said Robert the rector, farmed the said tithes of the monks of Norwich in his father's life time, and after his death, being rector also, farmed them all his life for 6s. per annum, and the said Richard, taking to himself a wife after Archbishop Becket's death, resigned the said rectory and the tithes into the hands of the monks: on this resignation,¹ Richard de Draiton became rector, and did not farm the

¹ Regist. Cath. Norw. 5.

said tithes, but Simon, son of Richard de Skerning, the aforesaid rector who resigned farmed them.

“ On the death of Richard de Draiton, Vincent became rector, and on Vincent’s death, the abbot of Waltham, and Simon, son of the said Vincent, being rectors of the Church, sued the above mentioned Simon, son of Richard de Skerning, on account of the said tithes farmed by him, insomuch that he resigned them into the hands of the said monks, who let them to Adam, brother of the said Simon, who agreed to resign them to Simon, son of Vincent the rector, and he farmed them all his life at 6s. per annum ; after this the said Simon, being desirous to provide for his nephew, Jeff. Pecche, resigned his moiety or rectory to Geff. (*sic*) who was instituted rector, and kept still the farm of these tithes all his life.”

Blomefield’s “ History of Norfolk,” Vol. XI, pp. 114 to 116.

RANWORTH.

Quoting from the “ Register of Langley Abbey,” folio 144, etc., Blomefield states that “ a woman named Elswyd, having the right of the said Church and oratory (i.e., Ranworth), married Ralph, Chaplain or Curate of Stokesby, to whom she gave the said church and oratory ; by Elswyd he had a son Hermer, who enjoyed it. . . . By the said register it appears that Ralph de Stokesby was instituted by Bishop Everard in the reign of Henry I and

Elswyd¹ before mentioned ; after this Hermer, her son, by Ralph the Chaplain,² Hermer being instituted by William Turbe, Bishop of Norwich.

“ The history above mentioned of Ralph the chaplain’s marriage, and his wife’s presenting him to the rectory, is a piece of antiquity highly valuable, as it fully and plainly proves that in the year 1174, when Turbus, the Bishop of Norwich, died, that the church of Rome, allowed of the marriage of the clergy, and their sons succeeding them in their Church preferments : and that there was no positive law, either Canon or Civil, to hinder it, as their own records and the register of Langley testify. And it is further to be observed that one of the witnesses in this cause³ deposed that he knew Ringolf the grandfather, Ralph the son, and Hermerus the grandson, all rectors successively of the Church of Ranworth, with Panxford Chapel annexed, and the same thing was also deposed by Ralph, Chaplain of Ranworth, son of Hermer.”

[*N.B.*—The Rectory and Manor of Ranworth was subsequently granted to the Abbey and Convent of Langley by Sir Roger de Cressy, “ in perpetual alms, John, Bishop of Norwich, confirming it——” Hence the occurrence of this information in the “ Register of Langley Abbey.”]

¹ As patroness of the benefice.

² As patron of the benefice.

³ A Cause as to whether the Church of Panxworth was a Chapel belonging to the Church of Ranworth.—“ Regist. Langley,” fol. 144.

"*Victoria County History of Norfolk*," Vol. II. (pp. 218-19.)

Herfast, Bishop of Elmham, consecrated 1070, "was the first foreigner who presided over the East Anglian see since the days of St. Felix." An opponent of Lanfranc, "he was a married man, and left a son who inherited considerable possessions from his father in Yorkshire at the time of the Survey."¹

"Herfast threw the weight of his influence in favour of the married clergy, and ordained one man as deacon and another as priest, though each had a wife from whom he refused to separate. Lanfranc interfered warmly in the case (*u.s. Letters*, 21 and 22) and ordered peremptorily that both men should be degraded. How it ended we are not told. . . ."

A successor to Herfast, who died in 1086, was appointed in the person of William de Bellafago, of whom we know little more than that he was one of the King's Chaplains; . . . like his two immediate predecessors he was a married man.² Celibacy continued to be more and more enforced upon the English clergy during the next two centuries, but instances of married priests are to be met with in Norfolk as late as the middle of the thirteenth century, and the frequent occurrence of such examples indicates that in East Anglia the

¹ "Dom. Bk." (Rec. Com.) I, fol. 327a.

² Planché, "The Conqueror and His Companions," II, p. 283. Munford, "Domesday Book of Norfolk," p. 31.

general feeling was rather in favour of the married men than the reverse."

(p. 221.)

Quotes Blomefield, III, p. 474, m. 7, that Bishop Everard de Montgomery, consecrated 12th June, 1121, was a married man. "It must have been a scandal and offence to Bishop Herbert's (de Losinga) monks at the priory that a married archdeacon should be set over them."

(pp. 229-30.)

"The non-residence of the Bishops during these seventy years (to 1244) appears to have told upon the discipline of the clergy in more ways than one. . . . We hear of no such diocesan synods as brought the bishop into close and personal relations with his clergy in the earlier times, and being left to themselves, they did as they pleased. One incidental proof of this is afforded by the numerous instances which occur of the marriage of the beneficed clergy in Norfolk during the twelfth and late into the thirteenth century."¹

¹ Examples cited in addition to those quoted by me :

"In the 'Hundred Rolls' (Rec. Com.), I, 481, we find that in 1273 'Radulfus, Rector Ecclesie de Topcroft' was thrown into prison with his three sons, and had to pay heavily for the release of two of them, though the third had actually died '*ob duritiam prisonis*.' In Farmer's notes under Tatterset St. Andrews, William de Hales (rector there in the episcopate of William de Middleton, 1278-88) '*habuit sororem . . . Rogeri de Tateshall cleric in uxorem*.' In a letter of Gregory IX, addressed to Bishop William de Raleigh the pope seems to be aware that in the Norwich diocese there would be a married

"*Norfolk Archæology*," Vol. I, pp. 68 to 70.

"Both before and subsequently to the Norman Invasion, many of the parochial clergy were married men; which might be proved by a variety of examples; and the recurrence of prohibitory canons from time to time leads us to the same point, for legislation would never have been thus elaborately applied to a mere nonentity. Among the articles of inquiry made in the diocese of Lincoln, in the year 1230, we find the following:

"*In. vj.* 'Whether any beneficed Clerks in Holy Orders be married?'

"*In. xx.* 'Whether any Rector or Vicar be the son of the last incumbent?'"

Again in the Legatine Constitutions of Cardinal Otho, A.D. 1237, Cap. XV: "It has been known to us that *many*, unmindful of their salvation, having contracted marriages in a clandestine way, retain both their preferment and their wives; that they get new benefices and are promoted to Holy Orders. Let such altogether be deprived of their benefices."

Once more, in the Constitutions of Walter, Bishop of Durham, A.D. 1255: "Let no beneficed clerk in Holy Orders marry a wife; if he should do so, let him be deprived of his benefice, and clergy, but that they must be checked in their attempts to hand down their benefices from father to son."—"Cal. of Papal Letters," I, 190; Opera, "Radulfus de Diceto" (Rolls Ser.), Pref., p. xiii.

suspended from the execution of his office, *unless in a case allowed by law.*"—(Wilkins' "Concilia," tom. I, pp. 627, etc., 653, 705.)

From A.D. 1255 to A.D. 1521 I can find nothing in the "Concilia" bearing upon our subject, but in the year last mentioned King Henry VIII issued a proclamation against some of the priesthood who had presumed to marry "without a common consent of his Highness and his realme," "prohibiting them from administering the Sacraments, and suspending them from office and benefice. ("Concilia," III, p. 696.) This was the *very last* edict which I have met with against the marriage of the clergy. In the very next year all the laws of compulsory celibacy (in England) were formally repealed by Convocation."¹

From "The History of Fincham," by the Rev. W. Blyth (1863).

(p. 69.)

In a list of "Deans of Fincham" he notes :

"S. D. Hugh. 'Hugone decano de Fyncham,' circa Henry III at Stow. In another deed, somewhat later, occurs as witness 'Hugh *fratre* Decani'; also 'Samson *filio* Decani de Fyncham,' evidencing a married ecclesiastic."

Cardinal Gasquet was good enough to write two letters in reply to my communication, and with

¹ The above occurs in a letter to R. G. P. Minty from R. Hart.

his most kind permission (for the letters were not written with a view to publication), I will give here some extracts from one of these letters.

“ You will remember that the point that interested me was the statement that no one thought much of clergy who were married, and that son succeeded father in the care of a parish almost as a matter of course. That there were many breaches of the law—especially in the earlier times—I quite believe and admit. But I have never been able to find that the abuses were ‘winked at’ by responsible authorities. Where people have gone wrong in reading the documents is by assuming . . . that when a clergyman is said to have a son—or a man is said to be the *son* of a priest, it must necessarily mean that the priest was married whilst being a priest. It may have been the case, but this is the very thing that has to be proved. It was by no means an uncommon thing for a married man with a family to take orders on his wife’s death. It is the same nowadays. I have known several priests who have had sons and once I married the son of a priest. Yet if the principle by which these old cases are judged be applied, people might say, ‘How shocking this is.’ Here is A, a Catholic priest, marrying without difficulty B, the ‘*filius presbyteri*’ C.

“ This is the first warning I would give as to judging these cases without proof, and as far as I can see there is absolutely none for the cases cited.

"Then, secondly, it must be remarked that *clericus* is not necessarily another name for *sacerdos*. There were many 'clerks' who could and did marry. Again, the *clerici* given may have been priests, but the presumption is that they were not. . . .

"There is one point more, not all *Rectors* were priests. Lyndwood, I remember, says: '*Etiam si Rectores non sint Presbyteri.*'" And in conclusion, His Eminence draws attention to another quotation from Lyndwood which speaks of the legitimacy of the son of a priest whose father had been married and been left a widower before taking Holy Orders.

Looking again at the cases before us, one is ready to agree that probably some of them could be disposed of by the explanations of the Cardinal, but I am still seeking for a final solution of the problem as to how the livings of Dunston, Ranworth and Scarning were held from father to son. Further evidence may be forthcoming at some future time, but at present no definite conclusion can be reached. At the same time it is significant to compare these cases with a clause from the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham in 1281, which provides "that priests' children should not succeed to their fathers' benefices."¹ This interesting quotation occurs in a letter from Mr. W. Paley Baildon, F.S.A., which appeared in the "Church Times" of

¹ The reference is to Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. II, p. 60.

November 11th, 1921, and from which I have ventured to make a few further extracts. "In England, at any rate," he says, "the rule of celibacy was resisted and resented until long after the Norman Conquest. Nor was it enforced. The late Canon James Raine, in his preface to Archbishop Gray's Register (Surtees Society, Vol. 56, p. xxvii), writes as follows :

"Clerical celibacy in the North seems to have been the exception for a long time after the Norman Conquest. The old Canons of Durham . . . were all married men, and so were the reformed Canons of York. In a remarkable letter which Gerard of York (1100-07) wrote to his brother, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, he complains bitterly of the officers of his Cathedral because they would not give up their wives. . . . The Register of Archbishop Gray shows that it continued for a longer time than has previously been supposed. In 1221 Pope Honorius III wrote to the Archbishop of York, desiring him to remove from their livings the married clergy. . . . It is evident that these papal and archiepiscopal orders were considered an invasion of long-established and salutary privileges and rights. . . ." In conclusion the writer draws attention to the fact that "John Romanus, Archbishop of York from 1285 to 1296, was the son of John Romanus, Canon, Subdean and Treasurer of York."

Such is the evidence which I have to offer to

celibates and anti-celibates alike. It is for them to decide which party can derive from it the greatest amount of historical support for the cause which they advocate.

A NORFOLK VILLAGE IN 1800

IN these difficult and perplexing days, when money and patience grow scarcer and scarcer, it is easy to turn our thoughts with envy to the "good old days." Perhaps when we do this, it does not occur to us to try and find out something of the condition of our Norfolk ancestors in the "brave days that were." To go back only a hundred and twenty years or so takes us at once into a *different* world, but whether it was a *better* one I leave you to judge!

In the year 1800 the Reverend Charles Smith was rector of the largish North Norfolk parish of South Repps. I don't know what kind of a parson he was, but he certainly took an interest in the social condition of his flock, for he left behind him a MS. book in which he had minutely recorded the status and condition of his parishioners, and the amount and method of distribution of Poor Relief in the years 1800-2.

The book begins with a detailed list of the aristocracy of the village—"Name, Rank, Children and Servants" are given. From this record it appears that the good rector himself had a wife and four children and that he kept six servants. (I doubt if a single Norfolk Rectory could be found in

1922 with such an ample establishment !) He had several parishioners of substance ; there was Robert Dawson Ellis, "gent.," married with no children, who yet had his seven servants ; Ollyet Woodhouse, "barrister," with a wife and three children, who kept five servants ; as did James Chapman, "farmer," though his family consisted only of a wife. Another farmer, William Woodrow, with two children, kept four servants ; the Reverend John Cubitt,¹ three (wife and one child) ; Mr. Hubbard, "farmer," three (three children) ; Jonathan Bond, "farmer," three (wife and five children) ; while the Reverend John Nedham (wife and one child) and farmers Jarvis and Carter kept two apiece ; farmer Robert Seago had but one ; while farmer William Seago, in spite (or because ?) of a wife and five children, had none at all.

So much for the well-to-do people of South Repps in 1800. There is no doubt that they were as a class a great deal more comfortably situated than their descendants in 1921, if the keeping of servants is any test of comfort ! Very few of the present inhabitants keep even one servant, and fewer still keep as many as two. But if the rich were richer in those days, the poor were infinitely poorer, as we shall see later when we come to consider the question of out-relief in 1800.

¹ This worthy pluralist was Rector of Overstrand and Waxham, and Curate of Sidestrand. He lived at South Repps and was buried at Sidestrand in 1841.

After enumerating the "quality," Mr. Smith next turns his attention to his working-class parishioners. Several of these too had attained to the distinction of keeping a domestic, viz., Widow Aldham, Thos. Bartram, "shopkeeper," Thos. Clarke, "gardener," James Darby, "collar-maker," whilst Joseph Cubitt, "miller," kept two.

It was the day of the small tradesman, and of the one hundred and sixty-one names of heads of households included in Mr. Smith's list of inhabitants, the following trades occur: Carpenters, 8; Bricklayers, 5; Gardeners, 4; Shoemakers, 3; Bakers, 2; Barbers, 2; Carriers, 2; Glovers, 2; Shopkeepers, 2; Tailors, 2; Blacksmith, 1; Butcher, 1; Collar-maker, 1; Landholder, 1; Man Servant, 1; Mariner, 1; Miller, 1; Publican, 1; Weaver, 1; Wheelwright, 1.

There were seventy of the inhabitants engaged in agriculture, eight were farmers and sixty-two were labourers. The remainder of the parishioners are described as "widows" or "spinsters."

The labouring class could muster two hundred and fifty children, the largest number in a family being seven, of which there are four examples.

After the list of inhabitants follows a list of persons living in other villages who were small landowners in South Repps, their occupations including carpenters, labourers, a mariner, a shoemaker, a blacksmith and a maltster.

South Repps in those days was a very "open"

parish, and a large number of the parishioners were small landowners or cottage-owners. The house rentals must have been very low, for in 1800 only one house was rated as high as £18 per annum, and that was the public-house. Next came one house at £7, three at £6, one at £5, and eight at £3 per annum. The rateable value of the eighty-seven cottages ranges from £1 to £2 10s.

The Town Land money periodically added a trifle to the labourers' slender income. In 1800, Lord Suffield was trustee, and £23 12s. 8d. was distributed as follows :

	£	s.	d.
67 men at 2s. 4d. each -	-	7	16 4
8 men at 2s. 2d. each -	-	0	17 4
69 women at 2s. 0d. each -	-	6	18 0
138 children at 1s. 2d. each -	-	8	1 0

The Town Land consisted of two acres let to the Rector at £2 2s. and two and a half acres let to three other persons at £2 12s. 6d.

The poor and infirm were also the recipients of doles from the "Sacrament Money." In 1800 there were twenty-two recipients, including seventeen widows. "James Howes, Old Man, Joseph Pye, Infirm Boy," and Ann Grey, Hannah Rice and Elizabeth Harmer, "Single Persons infirm."

There were thirty-one communicants to contribute to this fund, amongst them the Rector's wife and five servants, Mrs. Cubitt, Mrs. Ellis, Mrs. Nedham

and servant, Mrs. Bartram, besides six men and fourteen women.

Parochial charities or doles, however, were mere drops in the ocean of relief which was scattered about so freely and thoughtlessly in those good old days. In the year 1800, in South Repps, one hundred and three persons were in regular receipt of relief, in a parish whose householders numbered but a hundred and sixty-one. Some received a weekly allowance or "collection," others got a dole "at need," others again got goods supplied them from Mr. Bartram's shop in the village. The total cost of the poor to their fellow parishioners in this one year was £640 6s. 7½d. !

The information in the worthy Rector's book is not restricted to the year 1800. He has also given many extracts from earlier parochial records, and has copied out sundry removal certificates under the Acts of Settlement, besides a number of apprenticeship indentures between the years 1708 and 1764. Of the former type of entry the following is a curious example : " Joseph Cockman conveyed from the Parish of St. Mary Le Bow, London, as a Rogue and Vagabond, 1792.

" Do., conveyed with Phebe his wife, from the Parish and Township of Warrington, Lancashire, as a Rogue and Vagabond, 1794."

The latter part of the book is devoted to reports of the Vestry Meetings which were held "on the first Monday in every month," and which were

responsible for the administration of relief, the making of the Poor Rate, and a variety of other local business. For example, in April, 1801, orders are "given for Cloathing for the Poor, and for the planting of Potatoes for the relief of the Poor." A few months later, in August of the same year, the vestrymen had work of a more national kind to perform. The meeting was so urgent that it was held "in Church on Sunday Evening, August the 9th," its object being "to take into consideration the necessary measures for the defence of the Country against an invasion of the Enemy." The Rector, John Baker, Churchwarden, and William Woodrow, overseer, were present and adjourned the meeting until the following Tuesday, when seven persons attended. It is recorded that "the Papers sent by the Secretary of State to the Minister of the Parish were filled up conformable to the instructions contained therein." I expect a great many meetings of like nature took place in Norfolk in the years 1914-18. I was an interested listener at two held in my own village, and I expect our instructions from those in authority probably contained very much the same kind of information as did the papers sent in 1801—the only great difference being the nationality of the enemy! The Michaelmas meeting on October 5th is of particular interest, for it was on that occasion that the price of threshing was decided and the *maximum wage* for labourers was fixed for the ensuing half

year. It also settled upon the exact amount of wages which certain individual labourers were deemed capable of earning.

“ Agreed that the price of threshing be fixed at 1s. 6d. for wheat and 10d. for Barley and other grain pr. coomb : that 1s. 8d. be the maximum of day Labour till Lady Day 1802, and that the following persons be employed at the Wages annexed to their respective names, which they should be deemed capable of earning, in case they make any application to the overseer for relief :

Viz. : Robert Breeze	12d. pr. day
John Breeze	8d. do.
Berney Brereton	15d. do.
Sam. Cockman	14d. do.
Frans. Harmer	12d. do.
Thos. Jordan Sr.	6d. do.
Wm. Steward	14d. do.
Wm. Waller	9d. do.
Wm. Woodhouse	12d. do.”

Rules for the enforcement of a maximum wage must have been a more serious hardship than ever our minimum wage regulations can be.

Were the Hospitals in any sense “ on the Rates ” in those days ? At any rate, the October 5th meeting ordered “ the arrears of the subscription to the County Hospital to be paid.”

The same meeting “ ordered that £1 5s. 0d. be

given to John Breeze to enable him to pay his Rent, having been prevented by Infirmary from earning sufficient Harvest Wages. Ordered that £1 5s. od. be given to Wm. Waller for the same purpose and for the same reason. Ordered that £1 5s. od. be given to Saml. Cockman for the same purpose, having been taken ill during the time of Harvest, and having earned only 10s. 6d."

At the next meeting, on November 2nd, a note is made of "an application from Mr. Chapman for a Pew in the Church to be annexed to the Farm of late Mr. Johnsons, for the accommodation of the under Tenants of Do. Granted and N.14 to be set apart for them." I am afraid that this practice of allotting pews still survives in very many parishes, but people are realizing more and more that in the House of God all men are equal and that the Church seats should be free and open for the use of all comers.

In conclusion let me give one more curious entry, dated February 1st, 1802. "Hannah Cross petitioned that she might receive her weekly allowance without being compelled to live in the Workhouse, which she was ordered to do by the magistrates at the Petty Sessions, till she conducted herself in a more orderly manner in her Parish. Her Petition granted upon her promise of behaving better for the future."

I will end by asking you to compare these hard times in which we live with the good old times in

1800. Some of us think that labour to-day is overpaid and over-powerful, but surely we can congratulate ourselves that labour is not as underpaid, under-nourished and over-ruled as it was in the days before the reform of the old Poor Law. The rich have grown poorer, the poor richer, prosperity is more widespread, take it all in all. We can't regret the village of a hundred and twenty years ago, we must try not to complain of the village of 1922; rather we ought to work for better conditions for the village of the future.

NORFOLK RATES IN DAYS GONE-BY

THE burden of present-day high Rates is felt by householders all over England, and the newspapers are filled daily with protests and complaints against the ruinous imposts of local authorities. One day I chanced to turn from the laments of Norwich Ratepayers in the "Eastern Daily Press" to a tattered volume styled "Syderstrand Town Book," which I found contained the Overseers' accounts for that parish from Michaelmas, 1785, to the end of June, 1836. In its pages I could follow for fifty years the history of local rating in a rural parish in days gone-by, and a very interesting study I found it—so much so that it occurred to me that other readers too might like to hear of the troubles of Ratepayers in another century.

At the beginning of the period under consideration, Rates were high, but not terribly high, for the first thirteen half-years, from Michaelmas, 1785, onwards, the Rate varied from 2s. 9d. to 4s. 3d. in the £. After that there was a tendency for the Rates to rise, and from 1795 onwards to 1811 they were often 5s., 6s., 7s., or 7s. 6d. for the half year. Worse was to come. In the period of the last

phase of the Napoleonic War, and during the years which immediately followed Waterloo, Rates rose to an enormous height, as the following table will show.

LADY DAY TO MICHAELMAS.	MICHAELMAS TO LADY DAY.	TOTAL FOR 12 MONTHS.
<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
1812 8 0	1812-3 10 6	18 6
1813 10 6	1813-4 9 6	20 0
1814 7 0	1814-5 7 0	14 0
1815 6 6	1815-6 6 0	12 6
1816 8 6	1816-7 10 9	19 3
1817 13 0	1817-8 10 0	23 0
1818 8 6	(missing)	($\frac{1}{2}$ -year 8 6)
1819 9 0	1819-20 8 6	17 6
1820 8 0	1820-1 8 6	16 6
1821 7 0	1821-2 7 0	14 0
1822 7 0	1822-3 8 0	15 0
1823 7 0	1823-4 9 0	16 0
1824 10 0	1824-5 10 0	20 0
1825 10 0	1825-6 12 0	22 0
1826 10 6	1826-7 12 6	23 0
1827 12 0	1827-8 9 0	21 0
1828 6 6	1828-9 10 6	17 0
1829 10 0	(missing)	($\frac{1}{2}$ -year 10 0)
1830 7 0	1830-1 9 0	16 0

It will be noticed at once that Rates remained high for very many years after Peace had been established, and that the highest year of all¹ was

¹ Rates were 23s. again in 1826-7.

1817-18, rather more than two years after Waterloo. One cannot but be struck with the similarity of present-day conditions to those of 1817. Here are we, several years after the Armistice, with Rates higher than we have ever known them, and considerably higher than they were during the War. One can only hope that history will continue to repeat itself, and that our Rates will gradually decline as they did a century ago. However, we must not be over-sanguine as to the rapidity of the descent, for if they follow the precedent of history it will take fully another ten years to reduce them to anything like pre-War standards. And in these days of Rate-aided schemes who can foretell the charges which the Rates may have to meet a decade ahead? Returning to the old Rate Book, we find that after 1830, Rates appear to have come down rather more steadily, the half-year Rate being as low as 3s. 3d. and 3s. 6d. in 1832-33.

Each year the accounts were audited and afterwards presented to two Justices of the Peace for signature—William Windham, of Felbrigge, being one of the signing magistrates in 1785, and in several subsequent years. The accounts described as "disbursements by the overseers" abound in curious details of prices and local history. For example, we learn that in 1784-5 stockings cost 1s. 2½d. to 1s. 6d. a pair, a man's shirt 3s. 9d., two boy's shirts 2s. 4d., boy's breeches 6s.; while "a new gowne making and lining for the girl Abbs" cost

4s. 1½d. Shoes varied from 2s. 10d. for "Boy Abbs" upwards to 5s. 9d. for a man. Woollen materials were cheap, for Marya Abbs got "2 yards of stuff at 9d. yd." ; on the other hand a yard and a quarter of linen and half a yard of cotton cost 3s. 4½d. The best way to give some idea of the varied contents of the book is to make a selection of typical entries which can speak for themselves.

	£	s.	d.
1785. The Girl Green a New Bed Gowne..	4	4	½
New Blanket	6	0	
Mary Bacon's Boy a new Slop and making	1	2	
New Coate	3	4	
Paid Mary Latten for Nursing Na' House (6d. a night)	2	6	
(A later entry records " Paid Mary Bacon for Warshan [washing] N. Howes 2d. ! ")			
Sarah Clarke for setting up with do.	1	6	
For Tea, Brade and Butter do.....	1	1	
(Various women paid for Nursing for some weeks, one being given " Bread, Butter, Tea ½ pound of Candle 1s. 3d.")			
Bleeding the Girl Abbs.....		6	
Girl Abbs Gown topping.....	1	0	
Do. her Coate twilting		6	
The Bleeding of Hannah Harrison ..		6	
½ hundred Red Bricks	1	1	
Paid Mr. Gray the Hayword 2 years	3	0	
Ann Seago died 24 day of December . . . Her Shroud making and Winding her (Shroud 6d.).....	2	0	

144 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

		£	s.	d.
1875.	Toling the Bell and Digen the Grave		2	0
	Paid the Bearers		3	0
	Paid for a Coaffen		8	6
	(Other entries occur of "Shroud making and Laying forth and winding 2s. 6d.")			
1786-7.	Pd. for mending Robt. Bly Breeches		1	6
	To a peer of buskings for Robert Blyth			6
	To a peer of pattans for Eliz. Forrow		1	0
	To a new Spade for Matt Green		4	6
	John Wells for levelling the Ruts....		6	0
1787-8.	A coal grate		5	0
1788-9.	Paid to the Haiward		1	6
	To the Girl Green a Comb.....			6
	Expences of going to Norwich to get a copy of Fearer (Farrow's) will		13	0
	Paid Betty Hart for 2 Bottles of phisick for Grenes family in the Small pox		2	6
	(I have examined the Burial Register for 1789 and am surprised to find that none of the family died !)			
1789-90.	Expended for John Kirk at Bockhye (e.g. Beck Hythe, the old name for part of Overstrand).....		5	6
1790-1.	Paid for a Coffen for Forrow girl....		8	0
1791-2.	Expences going the Bounds Town (July 2)		6	2
	(Other references to "Beating the Bounds" occur April 22, 1811. "Paid the Expences going the Bounds Town (<i>sic</i>) 13s. 4d.			
May 13, 1825.	To Expences going the Boundary		4	3

BARTHOLOMEW SUFFERERS

145

		£	s.	d.
May 25.	Expended for Going Boundary ..		4	0
1832.	Paid for having the snow out of the roads (no month given).....		3	6
1793-4.	Samuel Todd for letting the warter out of the roads.....		1	0
	John Latten in the rodes 4 days....		4	0
1794-5.	Richard Simes for opening the roads		6	0
1806-7.	Paid to Thos. Gray in Affliction....		5	0
1808-9.	Nov. 11. Woman Kirk a Bushel of Meal when her husband in Prison		12	6
	Woman Long at Need when her husband in Prison.....		4	0
1810-1.	Jan. Lost by Danl. Muer (Daniel Moore was a farmer in the Parish and evidently a careless one!)	1	17	6
1813-4.	To the Appointment of a Guardienn.. (This is the first mention of a Guardian in the Accounts. A similar entry recurs in later years.)		2	0
	Batteress (<i>sic</i> for Beatrice) Wotts at Need		6	0
1814-5.	May 8. Paid the Dublycates (<i>sic</i> for Duplicates)		1	6
1817-8.	John Latten for Berring H. Abbs....		3	6
1819-20.	Wm. Wells to pay his Poor Rate.... (Here was a pretty pass when a man's Rates had to be paid out of the Rates. There are several other similar entries in subsequent years.)	10	11	

146 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

		£	s.	d.
1820-1.	Shoes for Boy Kirk (prices had risen since 1785)		8	0
	Coffen for Jn. Kirk (Coffins too were dearer !)	1	4	0
1821-2.	Marthy Smith a Bedstead.....	1	0	0
	Letter from London.....		11	
	Paid for a Letter		5	
1822-3.	2 Letters to Norwich.....		10	
1823-4.	July 4. Woodhouse for birds caught		6	6
1824-5.	July 1. To Woodhouse Catching 9 dozen birds at 6d. pr. dozen....		4	6
	Aug. 6. To Widow Gray Expences to Cornwell or elsewhere.....	5	0	0
	„ 22. To ditto and Children at Need at Cornwell by order of the Guardian		10	0
1825-6.	Postage of a letter.....		3	0
	6 Letters for Norwich		2	6
	June 10. Paid for catching of birds 17 dozen and distroying of 10 dozen eggs		16	0
1826-7.	Three letters		3	6
	Dec. 16. To Binding the Boy Gray	11	10	0
	To the Lawers Expences		7	6
1828-9.	Nov. 8. Two bed coverings for the Childrens Gray		9	6
	Jan. 10. To Gravel Reddle (?)....		8	6
	Lunitic warrant (ditto in 1831)		1	0
	Thomas Gray pair trowes.....		3	0
1830-1.	July 4. Mr. Baker taken Population returns		1	6
	Aug. 13. Maken Agricultural Labourers' Return out, etc.....		1	6

		£	s.	d.
1832-3.	Oct. 18. Mr. Plumbly for Cholara			
	Morbus Papers	10	0	
	„ 25. Three journeys to North			
	Walsham and making Lists for			
	Votes	1	0	0
1833-4.	Paid for Catching Birds.....	2	16	6
	Isaac Gray Emigrated to America..	10	0	0
	A Chest for Provision Clothes, etc...	5	0	
	Thos. Clark towards his Boat.....	5	0	
1835-6.	Paid Doy for Catching Birds	1	2	10
	May 19. Paid to Gurneys Bank....	10	15	0

These curious entries may entertain us with their quaintness, but there was a very serious side to them too. They tell a tale of a pauperized countryside where practically every labouring family was in receipt of some form of out-relief. Again and again labourers' rents had to be paid out of the Rates. On every page occur entries of relief "for want of labour," or "at need." In some years, notably 1813-14 and 1825-26, sickness contributed to the general poverty. Each half-year's accounts contains a list of the "Collection" or "Collectioners," viz., the names of those in receipt of a weekly allowance. The number varied in different years from seven in 1809 up to fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, and even as many as eighteen persons in 1825. In addition to the "Collectioners," doles of small sums were also distributed. There was the tragedy too of the paupers from other districts who were furnished with "passes" to return

thither—vagrants who, with their wives and children, were driven on from village to village, receiving doles of money or food, but who were not allowed to stay for forty days in any one place for fear that they should thereby obtain a settlement and become chargeable to the Rates of that parish. From 1786 to 1827 no fewer than 76 men, 61 women, and numberless children were relieved in Sidestrand in this way. The amount of money given was usually very small, and the following are typical entries :

			<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1789.	July.	Gave two men with their wives and children with a pass.....	1	6
1798.	Jan.	To nine men with a pass.....	2	0
1811.	May.	To seven women and nine children with a pass	3	6
1826.	June.	To an old Seaman in Distress.....	1	0
1827.	July.	To a seaman that lost all his property at sea with a pass.....	4	0

Individual men and women were usually granted 6d. or 1s. each. These unfortunate people owed their vagrant condition to the severe and unnatural restrictions of the various Acts of Settlement.

However abject its poverty, the village of those days still retained something of the old corporate life of an earlier and happier period. In many cases village property survived, as for example the Town House of Sidestrand, to which the Town Book makes several references.

		£	s.	d.
1786-7.	To half-a-year's rent of ye town house	1	0	0
	Pd. rent of Town house.....	1	0	0
1790-1.	To the glaser for the town house....	3	0	
1793-4.	Town-house Rent	1	15	0
	(Do. in 1795-6).			
1806.	Town-house Rent	1	0	0
1828.	March 21. For things for Town House	2	6	6
1829.	May 2. 20 faggots for Town House	1	8	
	Thomas Clarke 2 Day Work Town Garden	3	0	
	May 23. Setting Town Garden with Potatoes	2	8	
	June 27. $\frac{3}{4}$ -day's work in town Garden	1	3	
	Rent of town-house	3	3	0

What exactly the Town House was or where it stood I do not know, but it must have been the last remaining landmark of the old days of village self-government ; a survivor from a past age of independence and comparative comfort, going back to a time when the labourer was a self-supporting citizen, and before he had been ruined by the uneconomic and pauperizing legislation of the eighteenth century.

MANORIAL HISTORY

(A Paper read to the Norfolk Branch of the Historical Association, February, 1920.)

No less a man than the late F. W. Maitland maintained "that the time has not yet come when generalities about *the* English manor and its fortunes will be safe or sound"—hence the value of individual study of the subject, for the history of each particular manor has something to contribute to the study of the subject as a whole. This is a most stimulating doctrine for our local Association and its members to embrace, for it encourages us in the belief that any research in manorial history which we may undertake in our own locality *does* add something to the common stock of historical knowledge.

Apart from the higher ideal of offering our contribution to the study of history, there is also the personal side of research which gives to those who practise it an immediate reward in the sheer pleasure of handling old records and in reconstructing from them some kind of picture of the past, no matter how indistinct.

Manorial history is essentially social history, and

we can go to no better source if we wish to learn how men lived in country districts in the middle and earlier ages.

When J. R. Green wrote his "Short History of the English People," the study and teaching of history was largely limited to a knowledge of dates of battles and stirring political events, and it did not deal in any detail with the social condition of the people, nor did it attempt to show much of their progress and development. That book was published not so very long ago, and yet if you read it now you cannot help being conscious of the narrowness of its scope, nor can you fail to be surprised at how very little there really is in it about *the English people*—for example, the great Revolt of the Labourers in 1381 is described in the briefest possible manner. I only say this, not to criticize J. R. Green, but to point out to you the lines on which historical study has advanced since his time. History has rapidly become a science, and in no branch of historical science has more progress been made of late years than in social history, and I think we may claim that manorial history is a vital part of the study of community life in the past.

When you think to yourself of England as it was apportioned by William the Norman, you see the manorial system everywhere imposed—in every shire and hundred and village. Hence the wide-ness of its scope as a subject of study—as wide in

fact as the country itself. It is impossible to dogmatize on the subject of *the* manor; the best we can do is to learn what we can from the histories of special manors, and above all, if we want to get some sort of hold of the subject, let us try to get *inside* one particular manor through personal research.

And if we intend to do this the obvious starting-point is Domesday Book itself—that wonderful land survey and assessment which presents to us a report of practically every village in England, with its male inhabitants, its stock of beasts, its acreage of waste ground, pasture and arable. No modern Land Commission ever drew up so accurate and complete an account !

The description of the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex is contained in the second volume of Domesday, known as “ Little Domesday,” which was probably completed before the larger first volume. It is a more detailed survey than the other volume and the entries are longer and fuller. The survey of Norfolk in “ Little Domesday ” has one or two peculiarities which are worthy of notice. The land area in it is always the *carucate* or plough-land, not the *hide* as in so many other districts, and the carucate is not divided into *bovates* or *virgates* as elsewhere, but into *half carucates*, with the smaller fractions described in acres. In only one instance, at Merton, does the term *virgate* occur.

To understand the method of Domesday Book we must understand its purpose. It was a Geld Book, a Tax book, compiled with the intention of showing the extent of cultivated land in the kingdom, for all the wealth of the country lay then in agriculture, and so the unit of assessment for the tax was a unit of arable land. King William appointed Commissioners to make this great survey, and instructed them to obtain their information on the sworn testimony of the sheriff of the shire, of the lords in each hundred, and of the priest, reeve and six villeins of each vill. The information required was the title of the mansion, the number of plough teams "in demesne" (i.e., appertaining to the lord's estate), and the number of plough teams belonging to the tenants, how many villeins, cottars or bordars and serfs, how many free men and sokemen there were, how much woodland and meadow and pasture there was, and particulars of mills and fisheries. The present value had to be recorded, together with its value in the time of King Edward, and at the time of its grant by King William.

The tenants-in-chief claimed their holdings either as the successors of the pre-Conquest owners (their *antecessors*) by inheritance or otherwise, or else that they had received the estate by livery from the King—or occasionally they showed that they had obtained their lands by exchange.

Since the object of the survey was to assess

land, every calculation is based upon land areas ; and in this connexion let me remind you of what Professor Maitland called "the moveability of land"—that is to say, in order to make up a convenient and suitable geldable area, land in one vill could be added to land in another, and possibly distant, vill, to make up its geldable extent : for instance, portions of the vills of Knapton and Sidestrand were added "to complete the Manor of Gimingham" and to bring it up to the desired rateable value.

The extent of the *carucate* varied in different localities, these variations being accounted for by the soil of the district. This is easily understood when we remember that the *carucate* was actually the amount of land which one plough team of eight oxen could plough in a year, and it is obvious to everyone that eight oxen could plough a much larger acreage of light land than of heavy land. Roughly speaking, 120 acres seem to be an average *carucate*, but, as I have said, the extent varied greatly. In other counties we usually find the *carucate* subdivided into *virgates* of 30 acres each, the holder of each *virgate* being responsible for finding a yoke of oxen for the common plough, but, as I have said, in Norfolk this term is not employed, although the same system of agriculture prevailed.

In addition to surveying the land in *carucates* the compilers of Domesday Book often used such expressions as "the men have one plough, or one

and a half ploughs," or "the lord has two ploughs *in demesne*," which was merely another method of reckoning the quantity of land in the vill under the plough. Often we read of there being "one plough, formerly two"—the formerly referring to the days of King Edward.

The survey was not limited to arable land alone, and meadow, pasture, common or waste and marsh are all described, together with woodland or bruery for so many swine. This was the scope of the actual *land survey*.

Passing from the land to the buildings on it, you will quickly notice one or two characteristics of the survey, easily explained when we bear in mind its fiscal purpose. *Only such buildings are enumerated as bear some relation to the paying of geld*; for example, churches do not occur unless they are endowed with tax-paying land, so that we read of the church of such and such a vill having 20 acres of glebe, but the neighbouring church is not included because it is not a holder of land. In the same way, we read of the lord's hall, or manor house, because it is the capital of the fiscal unit, but we do not get any account of the other dwelling-houses of the manor, except the *corn mill*, which was an integral part both of manorial and agricultural life. (In passing, may I remind you that windmills were not yet invented and that the mills of Domesday Book were all water-mills.)

We must pass on rapidly to the people who held the land in the days of the Survey. First of all there were the great lords who were tenants-in-chief, holding directly from the King. It would take too long even to name the notable men who held land in the County of Norfolk at that time. Before leaving the subject, however, let us note that the King himself held 95 manors, while his half-brothers, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, and Robert, Count of Mortaigne, held 9 and 2 respectively. Far and away the largest landholders were Roger Bigod, ancestor of the earls of Norfolk, who held 189 manors, mostly in the south and east of the county, and William de Warenne, founder of the important family of the earls of Warenne and Surrey, whose holding extended to 145 manors in West and North Norfolk, with his castle at Castle-acre, and an important manor house at Gimingham.

For further particulars of the 63 tenants-in-chief of Domesday Book, let me refer you to the admirable introduction to its study in the "Victoria History of Norfolk."

Below these tenants-in-chief came the free-men and *sokemen*; the former can be described roughly as land-holding, rent-paying free tenants holding from the lord, while the sokemen (who occur only in the counties under Danish influence) are small independent landholders rather than tenants of the lord, who yet rendered to him certain dues in return for his protection—as Professor Vinogradoff

says, they are "the outcome of protection and not of tenure."

Next in order to these two free classes came the *villeins*, or dwellers in the *vill* or village, a class of semi-free small landholders, who were obliged to render services and dues to the lord in return for their land. The size of their holdings varied from a few acres upwards to the typical 30 acre *virgate*, or even to a double *virgate*.

Below the *villeins* again came the *bordars* or *cottars* with average holdings of about 5 acres.

Last of all there were the serfs or household thralls, who were a landless and servile class. But in Norfolk and the other "Danish Counties" there is a delightful absence of serfs, for the Northmen abhorred slavery, and you will find large numbers of Norfolk manors without so much as one serf included in their population. According to one historian's figures only 1 in 27 of the Norfolk population belonged to the servile class. In Suffolk there was 1 in 22½, in Essex 1 in 9. If we compare "Little Domesday" with the "Greater Domesday" it appears that in Lincolnshire and Huntingdon there were *no serfs* at all, but in other counties, such as Berkshire and Gloucestershire, the percentage was as high as 1 in 3 or 1 in 4 of the population. Norfolk men have always had a name for independence, and doubtless their free Danish origin, going back to the days of Domesday

and beyond, has something to do with this independence of character!

In the "Little Domesday Book" entries the stock on each manor is recorded. Of these animals I will only speak very briefly. Then, as now, West Norfolk was the sheep-breeding district, and in particular the salt marshes along the coast supported large flocks. Sheep were used for milk and cheese, as well as for mutton, and were therefore of very great importance at a period when cows were few in number. The plough-oxen, cows, pigs, and goats are all set down, and I think the modern Norfolk farmer would be horrified at the scarcity of stock. Bees are also recorded in some places—a valuable asset in those sugarless days. As to horses, at the time of the survey they were on the decrease, for we read again and again of two or three brood mares, where before there had been many more. The horse is usually described as a *rounce* or *rouncey*, a word found not only in Chaucer, but actually perpetuated in our own days in the familiar Norfolk surname of Rounce.

Other characteristic Norfolk references in Domesday Book describe the valuable river fisheries, whilst others recall to us a forgotten industry—the salt trade, which flourished in the salt-marsh districts, notably in the neighbourhood of Lynn and Yarmouth—at Caister, for example, there were no less than 39 salt pans in use.

To really know Domesday Book you must study

the text itself, preferably working at the analysis of one manor or group of manors. The translation in the "Victoria History" is very convenient, and, as I have already said, the introduction to it is a most valuable essay. Of course you can also find the entries relating to particular places in Blomefield—though the translations are not as clear or accurate as those in the "Victoria History." It is also extraordinarily interesting to look at the original volumes in the Museum at the Public Record Office, and astonishing to find the writing as clear and fresh as when it was written. You can inspect these wonderful volumes on any week-day afternoon, without the formality of a reader's ticket.

Domesday is a good starting point in manorial history, but it is not by any means the whole of the subject. We must therefore not spend too much time over the Great Survey but must pass on to its history in later times.

Many valuable books have been written about manorial organization—notably those of Professor Vinogradoff—and doubtless its main characteristics are familiar to you all. The manorial system is based upon the feudal theory of landholding and lordship, and is essentially the estate of a lord, held by him either from a greater lord or from the King himself. This theory was in opposition to the earlier old English and Danish institution of the Soke, which was rather a combination "through

mutual agreement " of the several dwellers and cultivators in a district, for purposes of protection.

The manor appears to have been a Norman innovation which altered the whole relationship of lord and tenant, and which was the chief factor in the transformation of the primitive agricultural village community, cultivating the soil in common, into the organized estate of a lord from whom, theoretically, all the lesser tenants held their plots and strips. Professor Vinogradoff defines the manor as an "estate or district in which the central house is the hall," serving the double purpose of the residence of the lord and the meeting place of the manor courts. These courts were the very essence of manorial life, for without the power of holding courts there could be no legal manor. The lord could hold no Court Baron unless the requisite number of free suitors was forthcoming, and no Court Leet without a competent body of hundredors and other tenants, whilst the Customary Court seems to have been almost entirely the concern of the tenants. It is very interesting to find that the co-operation of the tenants was absolutely necessary to secure to the lord his franchises. Lord and tenant alike were bound by the customs of the manor, and these customs were probably a source of protection to all parties.

The lord had certain special "liberties" of his own—such as the right to call a Court Baron or View of Frankepledge, assize of bread and ale, free

warren, wreck of sea in coastal manors and so on, and in many cases he also had the control of the local market or fair.

The village was much more of a community in those days, for with the Open Field system in force practically everyone had a stake in the soil. Whilst the rigorous protective trading restrictions of manorial life made it absolutely necessary for the community to be self-supporting. It is hard to realize at the present day that it was a punishable offence for a baker to sell his bread outside the manor to which he belonged!

We can reconstruct the village of the period from manor rolls and other documents. Around the village lay the three (or more) great open fields, divided by balks or mares into numerous $\frac{1}{2}$ -acre or acre strips. A group of such strips would be called a furlong—"Langdale furlong," "Townsend furlong" and such like names. The manor courts had to fix the rotation of crops in these open fields and the allotment of the strips to the different tenants. They also had to decide at what date the stubbles were to be thrown open as common feeding grounds—or, as we should say in Norfolk, when *Shack* might begin. The time had also to be fixed for the opening of the hay-meadows for pasture. The reeve and the hayward of each vill had to ensure the carrying out of these local ordinances, and in certain Norfolk manors they were assisted by an official called the wickner or wigner.

I have found numerous wickners occurring in the manor rolls of North-east Norfolk, but I have not heard of the title elsewhere, and should be very glad if East Anglian students would keep a look-out for it when working on manorial documents, and let me know if they come across *wickners* in other districts.

Many disputes arose from the straying of beasts in the unfenced countryside, and this necessitated the manorial pound, with the official punder in charge of it, who held the strays impounded until they were redeemed by their owners paying a fine.

Commons, then as now, were of very great benefit to the inhabitants of a village. According to manorial law the common, or waste, was actually the lord's property, but his land-holding tenants had the use of it, and they certainly had very extensive rights of common vested in themselves *if they were tenants of ancient tenements*. In the endless discussions on this subject which have taken place in Norfolk and elsewhere, this fact is often forgotten—the right to common is part of the tenure of a messuage and not the general right of any man who cares to build a house and settle in a village.

You will find that the theory of manorial tenure rests nearly always upon *the tenement* and not upon *its occupier*. For example, in the manor of Gimingham, the *House of Gryme* (or whatever it might be) would be "elected to fill the office of wickner for

one year, whereof Nicholas Bawchin is the tenant," and so on.

It is usually stated that common agriculture was the universal system of agriculture at any rate until the end of the thirteenth century, and that land was always granted by the lord in return for the various bond services, which were such an essential feature of manorial organization. I think that students had better not generalize on this subject, for the facts have not been sufficiently explored. In my small experience of research I have found two leases of land in Norfolk as early as 1240-42. In the Pipe Roll for 26 Hen. III, I find that Earl Warenne leased 100 acres of land in Gimingham for 74s. 4d., and 307 acres in Castleacre for £6 17s. 4d.—both high rents according to the currency of those days.

The extract from the Pipe Roll in which these figures occur is interesting in itself as giving the accounts of three Norfolk manors 680 years ago :

¹ " Account of John de Ulecot of the lands of the earl Warren in Norfolk, to wit Gymyngham, Castleacre and Marham, from 26th. July, 24 Henry III, to the day on which those manors were delivered to Henry de Neketon, that is to say, to the Feast of Michaelmas, 25 Henry III, who succeeded him in the shrievalty.

¹ Taken from " Pipe Roll " No. 86, 26 Henry III, m. 6, supplemented by " Chancellor's Roll," 26 Henry III, m. 9.

164 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

Rents of Assize.

He renders account for £75 6s. (or 7s.) 3½d. of the Rents of Assize, for the same period, from Gymyngnam: £19 10s. 4d. from Castleacre: 114s. 10½d. from Marham.

Lease of the Market.

£8 2s. 6d. issues of the mill of Gymyngnam. 32s. 6d. of the rent of the market. (Chancellor's Roll amplifies 'of the rent *of the farm* of the market,' showing that the market too was leased at this period.)

Lease of 100 acres.

74s. 4d. from 100 acres of land, put to farm at Gymyngnam, by the year.

Lease of 307 acres, etc.

£6 17s. 4d. for 300 acres of land and 7 acres of meadow put to farm in Castleacre, and pastures let by the year.

Sale of Rents in kind, etc.

31s. ½d. of the geese and hens of rent sold at Gymyngnam ('*de Ancis et gallines de redd vend apud Gymyngnam*').

2s. from 2 quarters of oats of rent sold there.

£20 from the Hundreds Galcol (*sic*, for Gallow; Chancellor's Roll gives it as Kaleho), and Brothercrow (*sic*, for Brothercross; C.R. gives it as Brothercrofts).

8d. one pound of pepper and one pound of cummin of rent.

£10 of Aid granted at Gymyngham.

Chevage, etc. ; Sale of Works.

£35 11s. 3½d. from chevage, herbage, fern (*fengcia*, P.R. ; *fengia*, C.R.), turbary, and dead wood, and of works sold, and of other small issues.

3s. chevage of Castleacre.

10 marks from the Hundred of Castleacre (*sic*, 'de Hundreda Castleacre').

In settled alms to the Prior of Lewes £8, by writ of the king.

Alms to Religious Houses.

In settled alms to the monks of ' Sancta Wylewaly' (C.R. gives ' Winewali '), 10s. 8d. and four horse-loads of barley in the manor of Marham, by writ of the king. (St. Winewaloy, Winwaloe or Winnall was the patron of a cell at Wereham, Norfolk, and of a Church in Norwich, afterwards re-dedicated to St. Catherine. His festival was on March 3rd, hence ' Winnal weather ' signifies stormy or March weather. See Dugdale, Blomefield and Forby).

Officials.

In acquittance of rent of reeves, bailiffs (or beadles), and parkers, 20s. 5d.

Wages and Robes.

In livery to the constable of Castleacre and a robe for him, and in livery to the servants of the

166 SEQUESTERED LOYALISTS AND

manor and their roses, and to the collectors of rent, £6 19s. 2d.

Stock and Grain.

One stott	}	£11 9s. 11d.
Two bulls		
43½ horse-loads of barley		
56 horse loads of oats		

Wages.

And in livery to the reeve and the bailiff in autumn, to the maid and to the keeper of the beasts at pasture ('*in herbagio*'), 22s. 4d.

Farm Expenses.

Mowing the meadows and autumn works ('*precaris autumnalibus*'), ploughshares, and the shoeing of the stotts, 26s. 4½d.

And for ploughing '*et warrand*¹ *et rebinand*' 140 acres, sowing the corn, hoeing it, mowing it, collecting it, carrying it, tossing it and husbanding it, £6 10s. 8d."

Of course villein tenure was the typical tenure at this period—the freemen and sokemen of Domesday Book had doubtless left descendants, some of whom had retained their free status, but others must have become merged in the general villein

¹ From "Warectare, to plough land intended for wheat in the Spring and let it lie fallow."—C. T. Martin, "The Record Interpreter." In Norfolk at the present day the verb "to wart" is commonly used in this connexion, and land is said to be "warted."

class. Villeinage had advantages and disadvantages—it insured both land and house to the tenant from father to son, it secured him from outside disturbance, and along with his holding he had a real voice in the management of the affairs of the village. As against this, he had to work for his lord in the field on fixed days and boon days and in harvest—but, after all, that was in lieu of a money rent—and he had to pay *merchet* if he wished to marry his daughter, and *chevage* if he wished to live outside the confines of the manor. On his death, too, his successor had to pay *heriot* before he could take up his inheritance—but, after all, I expect *heriot* was a trifle in comparison to the Death duties of modern times!

Bond tenure and payments in work and in kind were absolutely necessary so long as currency was as scarce as it was in those early days; with the gradual increase in the amount of coinage in circulation, a demand arose for money to be the medium of all transactions. First the Knights arranged to pay *scutage* or shield money instead of actually going to the Wars with their liege lord—the Knight had to pay £1 6s. 8d. on the £20 Knight's Fee. Next, the labourers began to make payments in commutation of their bond services. This marked a change in principle; obligations once performed in person could now be avoided by a money payment.

In a communal system all goes well so long as all perform their allotted tasks in the Common-

wealth—the failure of even one individual to do this throws an additional weight on to other shoulders and interferes materially with the working of the system. The very fact that some villeins had commuted their services for money payments made the position of the service-rendering villeins open to dispute; just as the first enclosures in the open fields upset the whole scheme of common agriculture.

This change came gradually, but a general discontent with the old conditions was becoming prevalent. The devastating plague of 1349–50 contributed to the unrest, for it left the comparatively few remaining labourers in a very strong position. When labour is scarce the labourer can get his hire, whether he is worthy of it or not! Before passing on to the Revolt of 1381, which originated from these causes, I should like to draw your attention to some of the accessible sources where you will find endless stores of information on manorial history and organization. First of all, there are the manor rolls, which contain all kinds of details of agricultural and other customs and tenures, which give many ancient field-names, besides recounting the various disputes of the inhabitants. You can find out from them the early family names in their manor or district, and can thereby make a real contribution to the work of the genealogist. The practical question for students is, Where are these rolls to be found?

1. *In the Public Record Office* in Chancery Lane you will find an enormous collection of rolls, all beautifully calendared and easy of access. (In order to obtain a student's ticket it is necessary to procure a form and get it signed by two householders. There is no fee.) There is a particularly good series of rolls belonging to the Duchy of Lancaster manors—many of which lie in Norfolk.

2. A large number of *Court Rolls* are in the hands of lords of manors and these cannot always be consulted—especially if they have been handed over to the family lawyer for safe keeping. Still, there are very many lords of manors and land-owners who are only too delighted to offer the student every facility for examining their muniments. I have been very fortunate in that respect, and Lord Suffield gave me the run of his collection at Gunton. These private muniments are often stored away with no attempt at sorting or arrangement, let alone any index or calendar to help the student. At the same time this inconvenience is a little compensated for by the excitement of discovery, for there is no knowing what may or may not be found in the chaos of a private collection!

3. Again *Court Rolls* turn up from time to time in unexpected places—in second-hand book lists for instance, or in the church chest—as they did at Tunstead in 1913, or stranger still in a stable-yard! Some years ago a well-known Norfolk property was bought by a certain citizen of Norwich,

his purchase including everything appertaining to the house and estate. Soon after his installation in the old place my parents went to call, leaving my sisters, then children, waiting in the carriage. The stable-yard was close by and the two coachmen began to talk, and finally the worthy citizen's servant produced a scrap of a Court Roll for my sisters to see, and told them that he had been given "a lot of them old papers to burn and he'd got rid of most of them, but they *were* bad stuff to burn!"

So, you see, you may find Court Rolls in any kind of place if you're on the look-out.

Another group of documents which amplify the Court Rolls are the *Ministers* (e.g., Reeves' and Stewards') *Accounts*, which give the current expenses of the lord's demesne and of the general outgoings and incomings of the manor. They are often full of most interesting information. There is an excellent collection of them in the P.R.O.

Rentals again are crammed full of details of tenants, tenure and old field names.

Of documents not strictly manorial and yet giving particulars of manors, the following are all worth consulting:

- (a) *The Inquisitions Post Mortem*, which often give quite a full survey of the deceased's estate.
 - (b) *The Pipe Rolls*
 - (c) *The Chancery Rolls*
 - (d) *The Close Rolls*
- } All contain interesting particulars, though they are often hard to find!

(e) *The Patent Rolls*, however, are nearly all fully calendared, and so are a good number of the Close Rolls.

The Feet of Fines give us details of land transactions. In Norfolk we are indeed fortunate in possessing printed abstracts of a very large number of the fines relating to the county, thanks to the public-spirited industry of Mr. Walter Rye.

These are just a few of the sources of manorial history for the student to dive into—and I can promise him that once he begins a little private research on his own, he will find it the most absorbing sport possible. I have only one fault to find with the P.R.O.—it is only open from 10 to 4, which, even if you omit luncheon, seems far too short a day for the searcher who is beginning to unravel some historical mystery, or who has just found the particular document which he has come up to London to look for!

We must now pass on to the great changes in manorial conditions which took place in the fourteenth century.

We have seen that as far back as Henry III's reign both military service and bond services had begun to be commuted for money—a new theory of the relation of lord and dependent had thus already been acknowledged by certain individuals of the community. By degrees a strong feeling against villeinage and its forced services grew up in the labouring population. The movement had,

therefore, *already begun* when the Black Death of 1349–50 swept over Europe from the East. This terrible pestilence must have carried away pretty well half the population of England, and in Norfolk it was as deadly, if not more deadly, than elsewhere—it appears to have been both a bubonic and also a pneumonic plague—and with the recollection of the pneumonia outbreak of 1919 still in our minds, we can realize a little the horrors of such an epidemic in those insanitary, unnursed and undoctored days. I have not time to go fully into the subject of the Great Pestilence as it was called—the title “Black Death” was invented many years afterwards—but I would refer those interested in the subject at large to get “The Black Death,” by Cardinal Gasquet, and for those particularly interested in its history in Norfolk to read Dr. Jessopp’s graphic essay in “The Coming of the Friars.” He there shows how parishes lost one, two or even three parsons in rapid succession, and how practically all the tenants of a manor often died of the disease, leaving no heir to pay *heriot* to the lord, or to take up the various holdings, so that the lords found themselves with quantities of land on their hands.

The Black Death is chiefly important to us to-night as being a great and sudden cleavage in manorial history; it was almost of necessity a breaking of tradition, and it was impossible when the plague had ceased for the country to resume life under the same conditions as heretofore. The

labour market, as we should call it, was in hopeless chaos; labour was very scarce, land was going begging, and it was hardly likely that the surviving labourers would be ready to cultivate it for nothing. They naturally demanded money wages, and at first they got them, banding themselves into what were really trades-unions to protect themselves from the attempts of the lords to enforce villein services. For a brief period the labourers looked like winning their independence, but Parliament grew frightened, and before they could really establish their position the notorious *Statute of Labourers* was passed, fixing wages at the rates prevailing in 1346—three years before the plague. In those days governments favoured maximum rather than minimum wages! Those who evaded the Statute were to be branded in the forehead with an F for falsity. The Statute must have been difficult to enforce, and in March, 1351, we find commissioners being appointed to go into the various counties “to execute the ordnance of labourers and servants.”

Our modern social instincts are outraged by such legislation, but our ancestors in the fourteenth century would have been still more scandalized by our modern methods of dealing with such questions. They based their actions on a sound enough communistic principle which we ignore, viz., that it is an abominable crime to reap any personal advantage from the necessities of other people, or of the nation.

Labourers were needful to the nation, and because there were few of them they must not claim any greater reward—that is how they argued.

The *Statute of Labourers* gave the lords an opportunity of enforcing bondage with increased severity, and in many cases they even revoked charters of manumission, or enfranchisement, which they had lately granted to their bondmen. But it was not likely that the labourers would forget their taste of independence—some were actually free, some had been free for a short time, and all desired personal freedom. It was but Christian justice that they demanded, and if they could not obtain it quietly they were prepared to use force. In “*Piers Plowman*” we read of the fourteenth century labourer :

“ He grieves against God and murmurs against reason
And then curses the King, and all his Counsel after,
For making such laws, labourers to grieve.”

Things were already bad enough and ripe for rebellion when still further misfortunes hastened its final outbreak—first of all the harvests failed in 1351 and 1369, then on top of discontent and discomfort came the obnoxious Poll Taxes, culminating in that of 1380. The workingmen of 1380 were no mere down-trodden, ignorant peasants, living a life hardly better than that of an animal—if they had been but that they would not have revolted. It was the very fact that they were rising in the social scale that made them discon-

tented with their lot ; it was " the contradiction which existed between their legal status and their material progress " which " exasperated them every day of their lives." Many of them knew something of Wiclif and his teaching, and everywhere new ideas and aspirations were stirring amongst the people.

The Rising, when it came, was a carefully planned campaign for the redress of long-standing grievances. For months before any outbreak occurred rumours had been circulated freely in country districts of a " Great Society " which was calling upon all working people to rise as one man and break off the yoke of bondage. Strange verses and words were passed from mouth to mouth :

" John Schep, some time St. Mary's priest at York, and now of Colchester, greeteth well John Nameless and John the Miller and John Carter, and biddeth them that they beware of guile in borough, and stand together in God's name, and biddeth Piers Plowman go to his work and chastise well Hob the Robber, and take with you John Trueman and all his fellows and no mo ; and look sharp you to one-head (union) and no mo."

" John Myller hath yground small, small, small.

The King's son of heaven shall pay for all.

Beware or ye be woe

Know your friend from your foe.

Have enough and say ' Ho ! '

And do well and better and flee sin,

And seek peace and hold therein,

And so bid John Trueman and all his fellows."

After months of preparation, suddenly the fire was kindled. We will limit ourselves to the course of the Rising in Suffolk and Norfolk—for once Suffolk must come first, for the Suffolk labourers were the first in the field.

Their leader was John Wrawe, Chaplain of Sudbury, and the call to arms was sounded there on June 12th, 1381. John Wrawe was in close communication with Wat Tyler and the Kentish men, and possibly got his orders from Tyler himself. He appears to have had a large body of Norfolk, Suffolk, Hertfordshire and Essex men under his command. Their first action was significant of the whole movement in East Anglia—it was an attack upon a *manor house*, that of Over Hall on the borders of Suffolk and Essex. The labourers were fighting the old system, and *manor houses* and *manor rolls* at once fell victims to their fury. Unfortunately the Suffolk men did not confine themselves to “a war against parchments,” as nearly all the Norfolk insurgents did, but many murders stained their record—notably that of John de Cavendish, a justice, who, unfortunately for him, had just been granted a rise in his salary on account of his duties in enforcing the *Statute of Labourers*!

The Prior of Bury and other monks also fell victims to mob justice. It is interesting to note that the Suffolk leaders included several members of county families—such as Richard Tolmache of

Bentley, Sir Thomas Cornerd, and James de Bedingfield—besides a good many of the lesser clergy. In Norfolk, men like Sir Roger Bacon, Thomas, son of Sir Thomas Gissing, and John de Montenay of Buckenham, also joined the popular standard. The real leader in Norfolk, however, was Geoffrey Lytster or Lister, a dyer of Felmingham—his name can still be seen on the roll of the Poll Tax of 1379. His lieutenants included John de Trunch, Sceth and Cubitt. For some while he had been sending his agents up and down the country preparing for the Rising, which opened in Norfolk about June 17th. Lytster assembled his men on Mousehold, and there he remained for some days to the terror of the sober citizens of Norwich. At this point of the insurrection the notable Sir Robert Salle lost his life in an altercation with the peasants, who thereupon entered the city, with flags flying, under the command of Sir Roger Bacon, and did a considerable amount of damage, besides killing Reginald de Eccles, justice of the peace.

In Norfolk the Rising appears to have been animated by various motives, differing in the Western and Eastern portions of the county. Though primarily an insurrection of the poor against the rich, in Lynn and its neighbourhood another factor was also at work, namely, hatred of the Flemish weavers, who had come into England in large numbers on the invitation of Edward III, whose action was prompted by a wish to improve

the quality of native manufactures. In this, however, he was disappointed, for the foreigners banded themselves together into a kind of trades-union which kept the secrets of its craft closely to itself. Hence the bitter animosity of the mob against these unfortunate foreigners. In other districts of West Norfolk the rebels seem to have been chiefly in search of plunder and formulated no special demands or grievances. They had one very fine man-hunt after two justices, John Holkham and Edmund Gurney, the latter being especially obnoxious to them by reason of his office of Steward in Norfolk to the unpopular John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. But on the whole the trend of events in West Norfolk was purposeless and lacked the guiding hand of a leader. In East Norfolk and Norwich, on the contrary, the Rising was distinctly political in character, and its leaders claimed certain definite social reforms, notably the abolition of bondage. In short, on the eastern side of the county the rebellion was quite impersonal and was seldom directed against particular landlords, whilst in the West it was really more in the nature of a class war.

I have not time to tell you in detail how Lytster and his men marched out in bands from Norwich into various parts of the county, everywhere burning Court Rolls (as containing the proofs of their servile status), but sparing men's lives. The last act of the short tragedy took place very near Lytster's native village of Felmingham. On the green at

Thorpe Market he had assembled his little army, calling to his standard the labourers from the neighbouring villages, and on June 22nd or 23rd he prepared for battle with the royal forces under Henry le Despencer, the warlike bishop of Norwich. The battle took place just outside of North Walsham on the Westwick side of the town, and, as you know, the poor labourers met that defeat which again and again has been the fate of popular movements born a few centuries before their time. (I hope you all know the Cross which still commemorates that defeat.¹)

I have taken too long over this story of social insurrection, and yet I have left unsaid much of what I wished to say. It is a very interesting and absorbing period of history, and I would like to draw your attention to the original sources to which we must go for first-hand information. In the P.R.O. you will find the *Ancient Indictments* (King's Bench, Class IX, No. 166) dealing with the accusations against the labourers and their leaders. Then there are the *Assize Rolls* giving some account of their trial and fate. And lastly, there are the *Escheater's Enrolled Accounts* in which you will get information as to the estates of executed traitors.

Of printed materials, nothing can exceed in interest André Réville's "Le Soulèvement des

¹ It stood formerly on the Heath to the right of the North Walsham and Norwich road near Westwick, but in modern times it was moved to its present position on the left of the main road.

Travailleurs en 1381" and Powell's "The East Anglia Rising, 1381," but since these admirable books were published the records from which they quote have been rearranged and renumbered, so that their references are often very difficult to trace. In a chapter on "The Rising of the Labourers" in my book, "The History of an East Anglian Soke," I have tried to correct these references in so far as they came within my scope, and I have given other transcriptions, references, and information bearing on the subject—much of it hitherto unpublished.

Added to these sources the "Book of Illustrious Henries," by Capgrave, the monk of Lynn, and the so-called "Chronicle of Thomas of Walsingham," both give full, though divergent, accounts of the events of 1381.

The Rising had little to show for the blood which had been shed on both sides, and yet it had brought about some sort of change of thought, and out of the failure of the labourers of 1381 arose a better conception of freedom, a greater distaste for bondage, and a distinct weakening in manorial organization.

The Rising ends a chapter in manorial history, and it also opens a fresh chapter. The history of the manor in the centuries which followed is the history of a rapidly decaying institution. If you will let me continue this subject at some future time, I should like to carry on the history of the manor down to modern times, but I have already taken

up too much of your time, and so I will bring this paper to its conclusion at this definite turning point in manorial history.

One further point I must bring to your notice—that rather obvious fact that since the labourers destroyed all the Court Rolls they could lay their hands on in the course of the Rising, rolls earlier than 1381 are comparatively scarce, while those of a later date are really fairly common. Rolls of a date immediately after 1381 often contain interesting particulars of damage done in the manor during the rebellion.

It may be of use to intending students to end with a bibliography.

For those wishing to master Court Hand, Wright's "Court Hand Restored" is a convenient handbook and can usually be obtained through a second-hand bookseller; but better still is "English Court Hand," by Charles Johnson and Hilary Jenkinson, published in 1915 by the Clarendon Press, with an accompanying portfolio of plates illustrating Court Hand.

For the study of the manor and its history, all Professor Vinogradoff's books are valuable beyond words, and so, of course, are Professor Maitland's "Domesday Book and Beyond" and Seebohm's "English Village Community."

Of detailed histories of particular Norfolk manors, Miss Davenport's "A Norfolk Manor" (Fornsett) is most useful, and my rather ponderous contribution

to the subject will, at any rate, point out to you some of the sources from which information can be obtained when other members of our Association undertake the writing of new and better histories of East Anglian manors.

CHANGES IN THE MANOR IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

(A Paper read to the Norfolk Branch of the Historical
Association, November, 1920.)

LAST February you were kind enough to listen patiently to a paper of mine on the early history of the manor in East Anglia, and to-night our Committee has asked me to go on to the later period of manorial history, and to trace for you the causes and results of the decay of the old system of country life. Last time, we left off our survey at the close of the fourteenth century—at a period when the Rising of the Labourers in 1381 had given actual and visible proof of the new ideas and ideals which were filling the minds of labourer and lord alike. A moment had been reached when personal freedom was becoming a practical necessity—labour was increasingly valuable, and an open labour market was the only right solution of the difficulties of both master and man. Each approached the problem from his own individual standpoint and, naturally enough, each had his own interests to consider.

Take first the case of the lords. The Black Death of 1349-50 had left the land bereft of about half of its agricultural population; holding after holding reverted to the lords, until their original demesne lands were increased by numerous additional strips scattered about the open fields. How could these best be kept in cultivation? Forced labour was out of the question, for the land was quite outside the scheme of demesne cultivation; new villein tenants were hard to come by in a depleted countryside. Two alternatives presented themselves to the lords, either they could employ paid labourers from outside the manor (who were probably runaway bondmen from far distant manors), or they could farm out the land on lease to some substantial tenant, bond or free, who would take the land at a definite money rent, and who would by so doing virtually free the land from the ancient services and dues which had hitherto taken the place of rent. In the first case, the lords required the equivalent of our wage-earning agricultural labourers; in the second case, they needed the equivalent of our rent-paying tenant farmers. Now both these classes were *in theory*, at any rate, innovations—they were outside the system of common agriculture, and as, through the centuries that followed, they increased in numbers, so inversely did the old scheme of things grow weaker and less efficient until, finally, it was extinguished by modern and individualistic methods. Another very important

consideration for the lords was their growing need of money. In early feudal days a lord had usually lived on, and of, his estate, i.e., he used it as a place of residence, and also as a kind of universal purveyor for the needs of himself and his household. But in the middle of the fourteenth century most lords found the attractions of London too great to be withstood, and off they went to share in the expensive gaieties of Edward III's Court. Their country estates no longer meant anything to them as *homes*, but they had become increasingly valuable as *sources of revenue*. Bondmen and bond-land were set free, land was put out to farm, licences to enclose were granted; in fact anything and everything was done which might bring in a little ready money for the non-resident landlord.

So you see that when all these points are taken together, the landlords were almost as keen for reform as were the labourers—and in spite of their rabid conservatism they had a very big share in bringing about the great changes which destroyed the old manorial system.

The labourers' case was founded not only on expediency like the lords', but also on the principles of justice and freedom, and they did not scruple to claim their manumission as a right rather than as a concession. With an increasing demand for paid labourers, it was no longer tolerable for villeins to be tied to their respective manors—fugitive bondmen were winked at by neighbouring lords,

only too glad to hire them as servants—and with these alterations in labour conditions it became more and more difficult to cultivate the land according to the old system. Reference to the Court Rolls of the period bears witness to this state of things—manumissions of villeins, licences to enclose, leases of land, all illustrate the change which was taking place; and along with these, endless presentments for petty offences against the open field system—fines for failing to observe the local customs with regard to cropping or *shack* time, failure to fulfil services due from the tenant, failure to fill the office of reeve or wickner, failure in short to obey the rules binding the old agricultural community together.

Modern writers (especially the Hamonds) are very apt to over-estimate the work accomplished by the enclosure movement of the eighteenth century. Certainly in Norfolk in the fifteenth century land was being enclosed rapidly, at any rate on a small scale—a close here, a piece there, and so on. In parishes in North Norfolk, whose history I have specially studied, I believe nearly all the enclosures go back to a comparatively early period, and in no case have I found an Enclosure Act referring in whole, or in part, to any one of them.

The subject of Enclosure under the Tudors has often been neglected by students, and perhaps you will allow me to draw your attention to its main causes and results. I need not tell a Norfolk

audience that during the early part of the fifteenth century the woollen industry was more prosperous than ever before—in fact, wool reached its highest price about 1430. What an inducement to take up sheep-farming! Lynn was the great centre and port of the wool trade, and it is not surprising to find that the adjacent landholders were quick to turn arable land into pasture whenever they got the chance. But it was not in North-west Norfolk only that the enclosing of land for pasture was becoming popular; the same state of affairs prevailed in more or less degree in other parts of England, with the result that numerous families were driven or even evicted from the land, many houses and buildings fell into disrepair, and the country became seriously depopulated.

Governments, then as now, loved to try and overrule the course of economic development, and in the sixth year of Henry VIII a proclamation was issued “concerninge the pulling downe of Townes” and its attendant misfortunes. Acts to enforce the proclamation followed, and finally, in 1517, a commission was appointed to inquire into the extent of enclosures and evictions in all counties from the year 1488 onwards to Michaelmas, 1518, when the commissioners were to make their report. Fortunately for our present purpose the returns for Norfolk are still in existence and form one of the Landsdowne MSS. in the British Museum. They are unusually detailed and full, and are com-

plete except for the returns for the Hundreds of Clackclose, Happing and Tunstead. From these returns we learn that in the years under consideration there were 125 enclosers of land in Norfolk, of whom some were landlords, some tenants, some copyholders (as, for example, at North Elmham, Tittleshall, Holkham, Blickling and Aylsham). In all, 186 enclosures were made during the period, 41 of which were made by ecclesiastics. The religious houses were engaged in sheep-farming like the other landlords, and it is not surprising to find enclosures being made by such a man as the Prior of Castleacre, who in his zeal for pasture even went so far as to destroy an "entire hamlet with all its tenants." Of the 10,454 acres enclosed in Norfolk which are described in the returns, 8,011 acres were enclosed by laymen and 2,443 acres by clerics. Of these enclosures 86 per cent. were laid down for pasture, and 14 per cent. only remained arable. In the returns for some of the other counties we read of numbers of evictions, but there is no mention of any in Norfolk, although we are given particulars of the destruction of 76 houses and of the "putting down" of 17 ploughs, which infer, according to one authority, the displacement of about 550 people. We also read of the destruction of a hamlet at Holt, as well as the one already quoted at Castleacre. Infringements of the *shack* rights of the tenants are also mentioned in several places—as well as the closing of common ways at Edgefield and

Blickling (where the encloser was Sir William Boleyn, Anne Boleyn's grandfather), and the seizing and enclosing of 27 acres of common at Ridlington and Crostwight called "le gresyng."

Not unnaturally we find that the largest extent of land enclosed was in the vicinity of Lynn. In the Freebridge Lynn Hundred 2,395 acres were enclosed, in Launditch Hundred 1,447 acres, in Smithdon 1,036 acres, and in North Greenhoe 892 acres (totalling, however, only just over, or just under, 3 per cent. of the whole acreage of the hundreds in question). Very few of the enclosures were on a large scale, with the exception of those at Flitcham, where 840 acres and 400 acres were enclosed. There were eighteen enclosures of between 200 and 100 acres, but the majority only dealt with small quantities of land. In fact, it was a very small percentage of the total acreage of Norfolk which was enclosed between 1488 and 1518.

The witty Tusser, a few years later, goes so far as to complain of the backwardness of Norfolk farmers in enclosing :

" In Norfolk, behold the despair of tillage
too much to be born . . .

The flocks of the lord of the soil,
Do yearly the winter corn wrong ;
The same in a manner they spoil,
With feeding so low and so long.
And therefore that champion field
Doth seldom good winter corn yield."

In the account of the Inquisition dealing with the village of Belawe (Belaugh) we get an interesting sidelight on the causes of enclosure. The report explains that in this and in divers other villages in the Hundred of Eynsford land has been laid down to pasture which before was arable, owing to the extent of the manufacture of "le worsted" in this hundred, which the writers consider to be detrimental to the hundred! ¹

It is the old complaint against sheep-farming:

"Shepe have eat up our meadows and our downes,
Our corne, our wood, whole villages and townes."

In spite of the commission of 1517 the evil increased, and for the next sixty or seventy years constant complaints were made by labourers, theologians, pamphleteers and politicians of the decay and depopulation of the countryside owing to excessive sheep-farming, enclosure and the engrossing (or amalgamating) of farms. A writer in 1546 says: "As for the lay sort, they fell to raising their old rents, turned their arable into pasture for grazing sheep, and enclosed commons, to the great oppression of the poor. . . . How do the rich men, and especially such as be sheepmongers, oppress the King's liege people, by devouring their common pastures with their sheep. So that the poor people are not able to keep a cow for the comfort of them

¹ Tunstead Hundred is omitted, hence no mention of enclosures in or near Worstead itself.

and of their poor families, but are like to starve and perish for hunger, if there be not provisions made shortly. What sheep ground scapeth these caterpillars of the common weal? How swarm they with abundance of flocks of sheep; and yet when was wool ever so dear, or mutton of so great a price?"¹

Two years later, in 1548, a further commission was appointed to inquire into the discontent "by reason of enclosing of lands for pasturage and the decay of tillage." In the proclamation issued at the same time emphasis is laid on the extreme wretchedness of the evicted tenants, who have "to seek them beings in other countries with great misery and poverty: insomuch as in time past ten, twenty, yea, in some places an hundred or two hundred Christian people have been inhabiting and kept households to the bringing up and nourishing of youth, and to the replenishing and fulfilling of his Majesty's realm with faithful subjects, . . . now there is nothing kept but sheep and bullocks. All that land which heretofore was tilled and occupied with so many men, and did bring forth not only divers families in work and labour, but also capons, hens, chickens, pigs and other furniture of the markets, is now gotten by insatiable greediness of mind into one or two men's hands, and scarcely dwelt upon by one poor shepherd. So

¹ Bacon's "Jewel of Joy."

that the realm thereby was brought to a marvellous desolation, houses decayed, parishes diminished, the force of the realm weakened, and Christian people, by the greedy covetousness of some men, eaten up and devoured of brute beasts and driven from their houses by sheep and bullocks."

One of the commissioners, John Hales, got himself into trouble, so vehemently did he take the side of the common people. He was accused of encouraging "the commonality against the nobility and that he would have *liberty, liberty*." He, on his side, cried out against "this most hurtful disease of the common wealth, *privat profit*." He declared too that "the sore was brought to such an extremity that if it were not remedied, all the realm would rue." He was careful to add, though, that the obnoxious enclosures were those which turned arable into pasture, and "*not hedging in lands*, but decaying of tillage and husbandry." The enclosure of land which was to be kept as arable land he considered to be "very beneficial to the commonwealth." Meanwhile, in another sphere of life, Hugh Latymer and Lever were both preaching against the evils of enclosure and rack-rents. A prayer against enclosure was actually included in the Edwardian Prayer Book: "We heartily pray Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit into the hearts of those that possess the grounds and pastures of the earth, that they remembering themselves to be Thy tenants may not rack not stretch out the rents

of their lands, nor yet take unreasonable fines . . . but may so let them out to others that the inhabitants may both be able to pay their rents, and also honestly to live and nourish their families. Give them grace also . . . that they . . . may be content with that which is sufficient and not join house to house and land to land, to the impoverishment of others, but so behave themselves in letting out their lands, tenements and pastures that after this life they may be received into everlasting dwelling places."

What was the state of affairs in Norfolk? A writer on April 28th, 1537, complains that "Ralph Rogerson said 'the gentlemen had all the farms and cattle in the country in their hands and the poor men could have nothing.'" A few years later, in 1549, these discontents came to a head in Kett's Rebellion. This Rebellion, so closely associated with Norwich, might well form a special subject for a lecture or paper from a member of our association. The broad facts are probably known to all of us. Let me just remind you to-night that Robert and William Kett and their followers began by throwing down the fences of newly-made enclosures at Attleborough, their campaign being largely directed against the enclosing landlords. They were also out for personal freedom: "We pray that all men may be free, for God made all free by His precious blood-shedding," was a clause in their "Requests and Demands."

Bondage in any shape or form was uncongenial to the mood of the sixteenth century, and its abolition was only a question of time. Unfortunately for the Ketts, popular risings seldom achieve their object, though most certainly they often pave the way for its eventual attainment. The Rebellion was put down and the ringleaders hanged, and apparently that was the end of the matter, but only a few years later Edward VI's sister, Elizabeth, engaged upon a systematic scheme for the ending of villeinage in every shape or form. Before, however, we pass on to that chapter in the history of the manor, it may be worth while to try and get a clear idea of the variety of tenures then existing in England. It is not sufficient definition to speak of tenure being either free or bond—there were many subdivisions of the latter class. The subject is one for a treatise rather than for a short paper like this, for the question is rather intricate, but I will try to put it as briefly as possible.

In the flourishing days of manorial organization you will remember that the land was divided into the demesne land of the lord and the strips of the tenants in the open fields. Now the demesne land itself was not usually all in the hands of the lord himself; some of it was holden in villeinage by tenants *at the will of the lord* and was called *Native Land*. They held their land *by copy of Court Roll*, and it was considered a Base Tenure because it was entirely a tenancy at will, with *uncertain*

services attached to it. Later on similar tenants were found on reclaimed common land. These were the two classes of tenant who were displaced by eviction under the Tudors, for their tenancy at will could be terminated by six months' notice from the lord—they had no real stake in their holdings. They were what Coke called "inferior copyholders." The test of Base Tenure was its *uncertainty*—the whole thing was dependent on the will of the lord.

But directly there was any stability in the tenant's position, directly he held his land for life, "according to the custom of the manor," we find that he had got to a higher level in the social scheme. He had a legal, and not only a local status. For instance, his tenement was so far his own that he was legally bound to repair it.¹ He was bound by the Customs of the manor, and not by the will of the lord, and the Customary Court was the guardian of his rights and position—he belonged in fact to a superior class of copyholder.

Villein tenure proper was in a still better position. The land was held by the verge and not by copy of Court Roll, and the tenant did fealty for it—the doing of fealty giving him a fixed estate and not merely tenancy at will. The oath of a villein was as follows: "Here you my lord, R, that I, W, from this day forth to you shall be faithful and lowly, and to you shall do all the customs and

¹ 1278. "Statute of Gloucester." 6 Ed. I. c. 5.

services that I ought to do to you, for the lands that I hold of you in villeinage." "The implication is that the Customs are fixed, and that, being performed, the tenure is secure"¹ Certainly in later times any grant of land to a man and his *heirs* inferred enfranchisement.

I do not pretend to be an expert in the technicalities of villein and base tenure and status, and I daresay I am fanciful in a conjecture that I hold, but it seems to me that the whole question of ancient tenures has in it much of general interest, for it helps us to understand why, at the present time, some land is freehold, some copyhold with fine certain, and some with fine arbitrary. The question of bond tenure also bears closely on the subject which we must now consider—the final enfranchisement of the labourer.

It is often asserted that in its later phases bondage was merely a legal fiction. It is hard to reconcile this theory with my own experience gained in the study of Rolls and other documents dealing with certain villages in North Norfolk. In the sixteenth century, villeinage was still a troublesome disability which the tenants did all in their power to evade. Some of them still continued to perform their bond services, others got them commuted for money rents, whilst others again showed their dislike of the system by doing

¹ Leadam: "The Domesday of Inclosure, 1517," p. 213. The subject is very fully dealt with in this valuable work.

their works "very evil." Shortly after Kett's Rebellion, Sir Peter Rede, farmer of the Duchy of Lancaster manor of Gymyngnam-Lancaster, seems to have made an effort to enforce a uniform performance of the bond works. The local evidence on the subject is preserved in the Duchy of Lancaster Pleadings in the P.R.O. The testimony of the witnesses is somewhat conflicting, for the first three depose that they know of no refusal of tenants to perform their services, nor of any attempt to withhold work with the plough. The other witnesses, on the contrary, describe how "one Margetson hath within this yeare withholden one plough work that hath been done before tyme"; how another tenant has been warned to work in harvest and has not done it, and how the tenants of North Repps decline to perform 32 harvest works, declaring that they had not done them for the past 200 years, but had compounded for them. Complaints are also made that neither the hayward nor his deputy had properly surveyed the plough works, and another tenant finally deposes "that doing his raking work in harvest he was requested to do his work well by the farmer, and to se and admonish others to do the same, wherein when he did speak to other tenants . . . they were very much offended with him and did their said workes very evil notwithstanding"

Evidently then there was no regularity in the performance of the services, and it was necessary

to get a decision from the Duchy Court for the guidance of the farmer and tenants alike. This decision enforced the performance of all works and services binding, by reason of tenure, on all land which "has been tilled and eared within the past 60 years," and the said services were to be *properly* done. At the same time it is stated that it is legal to compound for services at the rate of 1d. for each day service, and no tenant who has so compounded is liable to be called upon to work.

The services which were to be enforced were numerous and various and seem anything but a legal fiction. Plough works, harvest works, weedings, cartings, Boon days, Hay mowings, all figure in the lengthy lists which I have printed in my "History of an East Anglian Soke." If you still doubt the fact of sixteenth-century bondage I would ask you to give your careful consideration to these facts and figures relating to the Soke of Gimingham. I do not mean to insist that *all* the works enumerated were actually carried out, but I want to emphasize the fact that well on into the reign of Elizabeth tenants were still liable by their tenure to bond services, or in default to compound for them with the wickner or other manorial officer. I think the bond tenants of the period would have been very surprised if they had been told that bondage had ceased to exist ! After all, only a few years earlier, in the Court Rolls of Henry VIII's reign, we find them paying to the lord *merchet* and

chevage, and all the old dues which were the very essence of bondage!

For some time past, however, most lords of manors had been only too glad that on their estates bondage should be allowed to die a natural death—the legal presumption of manumission in the case of a tenement being granted to a man *and his heirs* hastened the process of enfranchisement, and what with charters of manumission, fugitive bondmen, and the very widespread dislike of anything that savoured of slavery, bondage was in a fair way to disappear. In a contemporary work, Fitzherbert's "Surveyenge," the writer exclaims: "How be it in some places the bondemen contynue as yet, the which me semeth is the greatest inconvenience that now is suffred by the lawe. That is, to have any Christen man bounden to another, and to have the rule of his body, landes and goodes, that hys wyfe, chyldren and servauntes have laboured for, all their life tyme, to be so taken, lyke as and it were extorcion or bribery."

As I have already said, little or nothing was done to free the bondmen under Edward VI, but during Elizabeth's reign a real campaign of enfranchisement was begun. Curiously enough up to that time the Royal and Duchy of Lancaster manors had been specially backward in freeing their bondmen. In the Duchy manors whose history I have studied, villeinage still flourished in the sixteenth century. Even at that late date, *in legal*

theory, the lord still owned, not only the holding of the bondman, but also all his personal possessions, besides being responsible for his debts both owing and owed. He could claim, moreover, all or any of his bondman's goods in return for his compulsory enfranchisement. The astute Elizabeth farmed out this privilege, practically obsolete though it was, to sundry of her courtiers, empowering them to force manumission upon the bondmen of her several estates at their own price. The bondman was forbidden to refuse this strange imposition of freedom on pain of forfeiture of all his goods. Elizabeth granted to a certain Sir Henry Lee, Knight, the privilege of enfranchising three hundred bondmen on the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster, and forty-four of them were *regardant* to the manor of Gimingham.

Naturally their status varied considerably, and elsewhere I have printed in full typical inventories of three of these Gimingham villeins. The first, a farmer named Thomas Calke of Paston, held 28 acres of land, cropped in wheat, barley, oats and pease—the crops being valued at £7. He also had 6 milch cows, valued at 20s., 10 ewes at 3s. 4d., 10 lambs at 20d., 2 geldings for the cart, value £3, 3 mares value £3 10s., 6 swine value 15s., 6 pigs value 4s., 6 geese value 2s., and 20 hens and 1 cock value 5s. In addition to his farm property he had a good supply of household stuff, together with 1 cart, 1 tumbrell, 1 plough and 1 pair of traces—

in fact, Thomas Calke was in a very comfortable position, and was not at all one's idea of a down-trodden bondman.

The next case is that of William Packeman, fisherman, of Mundesley, who held neither land nor live stock, but possessed only a miserable collection of household things, in all valued at 44s. 10d.

The third inventory is that of John Kyng, "thelder," of Norwich, Dornex¹ weaver. He was in a different position altogether, with two tenements in the parish of St. Mary Coslany, worth £24, with valuable furniture and looms totalling £17 3s. 10d., and debts owed to him of £20 13s. 4d.—the value of his entire property reaching the large sum total of £117. He was, in fact, a substantial Norwich citizen, and one wonders if Sir Henry Lee was able to fix upon him the onus of bondage. Perhaps he failed to do so, for though I have found the deeds of enfranchisement of Calke and Packeman amongst the Duchy of Lancaster Records, I have not been successful in discovering one relating to John Kyng.

During the short period under consideration Sir Henry Lee alone was responsible for the enfranchisement of 300 persons, and doubtless he made a very good thing out of the transaction. He was a very sleuth-hound at tracking down *concealed* bondmen, forcing them to own their servile origin and then

¹ An inferior kind of damask, of silk, wool, linen, thread and gold, made in Flanders at Dorneck (Tournai), often used for copes.

compelling them to pay him well for their manumission. Sundry suits in the Duchy of Lancaster records give us an idea of the pleas and arguments put forward by respectable citizens and tenants in their, usually vain, attempts to prove themselves *free and frank* men.

This evidence surely refutes the old theory that Elizabethan bondage was only a nominal obligation, rarely, if ever, enforced. Bondage as a system may have been dead, or at any rate dying in the sixteenth century, but individual bondmen were still common enough, as the records of the period show. Elizabeth's last charters of manumission are dated 1599 and virtually *personal* bondage must have ended then. Nevertheless, the terms bondmen and bond tenure go on occurring in the Court Rolls of Gimingham almost as frequently as heretofore. As late as 1632 we get land described as "native land," whilst the reeve's accounts in 1649 include the sum of £7 6s. 4½d. for the sale of bond works, which had been allowed to fall into arrears during the past sixteen years, and for many years before—making a total sum due in arrears of £117 1s. 8d. If the tenants could with impunity run up an account against themselves like this without serious interference from the authorities, we may well conclude that the obligations of bond tenure had practically ceased to be enforced by 1650. A curious survival in the manor of Gimingham was, however, noted by a writer in 1784, who remarked

that in that place "is still kept up the ancient tenure of socage, when the copyhold tenant, instead of paying his money, works several days for the lord of the manor."¹

Our survey to-night has been mainly confined to changes in the manor during the sixteenth century—perhaps no other century holds such a record of change and progress; of revolution and reformation and renaissance—the overturning of the agricultural system was only a very small part of that general upheaval of ideas, from which was evolved the modern world of literature, art, politics, and religion. It is true that Open Fields existed in large numbers for another century or more, but the old order *had* changed and the agricultural position is summed up in the fact that land had become a *saleable commodity*. Up to that time land could be *held*, but not *owned*, and the holding of it, or its transfer, was closely bound up in the feudal and manorial system. As feudalism gradually passed away, and as enclosure consolidated holdings, a new sense of *ownership* developed, and this was, of course, strengthened by the freeing of both land and labourer from the obligations of villein tenure. The great rise in the value of the land, brought about by the prosperity of the wool trade, tempted the merchants and tradesmen of the cities to speculate in land, and so for the first

¹ G. A. Walpoole: "The New and Complete Traveller," p. 405.

time the art of agriculture became tainted with the new commercial spirit. In subsequent centuries speculation and trading in land became increasingly common, and I may well end my paper here since the later developments of agriculture and industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are a special study in themselves, and should not be combined with a survey of manorial conditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Leadam : " The Domesday of Enclosure, 1517." R. Hist. Soc. (also in vols. VI and VII, N.S. of their Transactions).

Prothero : " English Farming, Past and Present."

Savine : " Bondmen under the Tudors." R. Hist. Soc., vol. XVIII, N.S.

Marriott : " English Land System."

Gonner : " Common Land and Enclosure."

Scrutton : " Commons and Common Fields."

Printed in Great Britain by Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., Norwich.

M88114

DA27

146

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

